

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 399

SO 016 114

AUTHOR Reed, Beth, Ed.; And Others
TITLE Toward A Feminist Transformation of the Academy.
Proceedings of the Annual GLCA Women's Studies
Conference (5th, November 2-4, 1979).
INSTITUTION Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor, MI.
Women's Studies Program.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 74p.; For proceedings of other conferences, see SO
016 113-117.
AVAILABLE FROM GLCA Women's Studies Program, 220 Collingwood, Suite.
240, Ann Arbor, MI 48103 (\$5.00).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Art; Critical Thinking; Curriculum Development;
Developing Nations; Educational Change; *Feminism;
Friendship; Higher Education; Integrated Curriculum;
Scholarship; Sex Bias; Sex Fairness; Sex Stereotypes;
Women Faculty; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS Women in Development; Women in Literature

ABSTRACT

A keynote address, seven papers, and a panel discussion are presented in these conference proceedings. The keynote address, "Friends and Critics: The Feminist Academy" (Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich), focuses on the interrelationship between critique and friendship and the importance of both to feminist scholarship. The first of seven selected papers, "Have Women Always Been Unequal?" (Rita Smith Kipp), condenses recent anthropological research on women's status. The second paper, "The Feminist Academy and Third World Women" (Nellice Gillespie-Woltemade), warns against imposing American forms of feminism on Third World women, while encouraging a two-way exchange of values, ideas, and skills. Other papers include "Feminism and the Established Curriculum in British and American Literature" (Nicholas Jones), "Effects of Isolation on the Woman Artist" (Joyce Parr), "Historiogenic Art: Camouflage and Plumage" (Bonnie Woods), "Do Contemporary Films Significantly Critique Patriarchy?" (John Schilb), and "Recruiting and Retaining Women Faculty" (Jon Fuller). A final presentation entitled "Curriculum Reform, or What Do You Mean, 'Our College Should Have a Feminist Curriculum?'" (Allison Bernstein, Louis Brakeman, Paula Goldsmid, and Elizabeth Minnich) and a schedule of conference events conclude the document. (LH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED251399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katherine Loring

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy

Proceedings of the Fifth Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference

November 2-4, 1979

Edited by Beth Reed
Editorial Committee: Len Berkey, Margaret Fete,
Beverly Purrington, and Kathleen Reish

The Great Lakes Colleges Association
Women's Studies Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Keynote Address: FRIENDS AND CRITICS: THE FEMINIST ACADEMY

Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich 1

Selected Papers

HAVE WOMEN ALWAYS BEEN UNEQUAL?

Rita Smith Kipp 12

THE FEMINIST ACADEMY AND THIRD WORLD WOMEN

Nellice Gillespie-Woltemade 19

FEMINISM AND THE ESTABLISHED CURRICULUM IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE

Nicholas Jones 28

EFFECTS OF ISOLATION ON THE WOMAN ARTIST

Joyce Parr 31

HISTORIOGENIC ART: CAMOUFLAGE AND PLUMAGE

Bonnie Woods 34

DO CONTEMPORARY FILMS SIGNIFICANTLY CRITIQUE PATRIARCHY?

John Schilb 37

RECRUITING AND RETAINING WOMEN FACULTY

Jon Fuller 43

Closing Panel: CURRICULUM REFORM, OR WHAT DO YOU MEAN, "OUR COLLEGE SHOULD HAVE A FEMINIST CURRICULUM"?

Alison Bernstein, Louis Brakeman, Paula Goldsmid, and Elizabeth Minnich 49

Schedule of Conference Events 64

The papers in this publication are edited versions of the Conference presentations. The closing panel discussion was transcribed, then edited for clarity, while maintaining, we hope, the essential flavor and spontaneous character.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association includes the following institutions: Albion College, Antioch University, Denison University, DePauw University, Earlham College, Hope College, Kalamazoo College, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Wabash College, and The College of Wooster.

Keynote Address

FRIENDS AND CRITICS: THE FEMINIST ACADEMY
Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich, Barnard College

Throughout my talk, I will use the terms "feminist academy" and "transformed academy" almost interchangeably, but I have chosen to focus on the "feminist academy" because it makes more explicit how we wish to transform what is into what we are finally ready to come out and say we want. I will also be somewhat less detailed and practical than usual, because I think we need this time together to seek understanding and vision before we return again to the pressing practical dimension of how to effect change. The first and final question is always what we want, what our purpose is.

The problem in talking about "the feminist academy" is, as always, to decide what we mean by "feminist"—no small task, it would seem. But since I believe that it means what we are making it mean—that it is a term still in process, just as we are people still in process—I shall proceed by looking behind what we are doing and how we are doing it to see what we are, together, creating.

What is it that marks our work as feminist? On the most basic level, I think that feminism has to do with a cast of mind—a way of thinking, and a movement of the heart and spirit—a way of being and acting with and for others. The cast of mind is fundamentally one of critique; the movement of heart is toward friendship. Both are strongly personal in that they must first be chosen and then developed by each one of us on her own, and both enable as well as require us to stand on our own even as we stand with others. Both also unite the personal with the social and the political by questioning, and then refusing, barriers (intellectual and actual) between kinds of acts, ways of being, kinds of people that have been strictly labelled as private or public. And this refusal is, of course, very important because it is by refusing people access to the public, to the political, that those in power keep power—and deny those they exploit crucial personal as well as political sources of identity, of experience, of strength. It is time we returned the distinction between what is private and what is public to its proper status as a useful intellectual distinction and broke its hold as a harmful political prescription with very serious consequences for every part of our lives—including, of course, education.

These are the themes, the issues, I would like to explore. You will recognize them again and again as I talk.

Let me speak first about the cast of mind and then about the movement of heart I take to be feminist.

The cast of mind is one of critique, is critical in the technical sense. Feminist thought takes nothing as given or settled for all time. It accepts

no truths as revealed and holds none to be directly reflective of what is "natural" and so unquestionable. It sees the prescription in apparently descriptive statements. It is radical: it seeks the roots. And it is radical also in that it evaluates even the roots to see whether they are sound or rotten, with the determination to learn how to make new roots if necessary. I know that's an odd twist on the metaphor: You can't make roots, can you? They are natural things. But critical thinking, feminist thinking, is in quest of just such fundamental--founding--metaphors, and refuses to accept them passively. "The roots of the tree of knowledge," for example, is a metaphor carrying with it the unadmitted and therefore unargued, unexamined impression that knowledge is something natural and, like a tree, grows only by increment, inch by inch, and at its own slow pace. Trees, mind you, can only change within certain limits or they protest by dying. Is knowledge like that? Hardly.

We have rediscovered what the guardians of knowledge have wanted us to forget: that knowledge and all the methods we have of obtaining it are human constructions. They are, indeed, man-made and so could be human-made. Of course they are. What else could they be? No one "discovered" the scientific method, the forms of rhyme, the methods of the historian. They aren't out there growing away, ready to be stumbled on, or laid claim to, or planted with our name and our flag. They were developed, and discarded, according to whether, and then how well, they served a purpose. The critical attitude leads us to seek the deepest level, the level of unquestioned assumption (which not at all infrequently turns out to be in metaphorical form), and then asks of the unquestionables what purpose they serve--and whose purposes they serve.

We have been critical in this sense when we have asked questions about the curriculum as a whole and about the content of the courses in it, and the results of our questions have led us to realize that what is taught is neither natural nor necessary. It isn't even particularly traditional, since most so-called "traditional" liberal arts subjects have developed very recently indeed and bear no resemblance whatsoever to the quadrivium and the trivium of the original liberal arts, to rhetoric, dialectic, grammar, mensuration.

We started by asking a few innocent questions such as "Why are no women mentioned in history courses?" To our surprise, we not only found no answers (acceptable or unacceptable), but a refusal of the question itself, a clear indication that we had hit on a very important question indeed. Bit by bit, we uncovered the roots of history. We saw for ourselves the white male scholars picking out what was "worthy" of remembrance and what constituted an explanation. We were excluded from both the story and the analysis. It was his-story. We had found the limits not only of the garden but of the guardians of the garden, the root-makers themselves. And we learned something genuinely liberating: It is very often precisely what is most important to those in power that is labelled "non-political" (meaning not open to negotiation), or "non-academic" (not open to discussion), or "natural" (not open to change).

The so-called lack of legitimacy of the women's studies courses that have grown out of our initial questioning, the doubt so readily and audibly cast on their necessity, indicate that they are important. No one says Asian (or

American or ...) studies are unnecessary because "man covers us all," or objects that it would be "divisive" to study European history. No one objects to classes on child development by saying "children are covered in 'regular' psychology courses so we don't need a separate course." No one says we shouldn't have separate courses on Flemish and on French painters because "we study all the great artists and shouldn't demean anyone by giving them a special label." But they say these things about courses on women and blacks. Studying us is not considered legitimate because we are not considered legitimate, and that reveals to us just what the terms of legitimacy are and whom they serve (certainly not us).

Feminist thinking crosses the line between the personal and the political and then goes farther. It steps outside the limits and sees them not as given but as imposed and therefore as open to change. The full meaning of this vision is very important: We have begun changing the very definition of knowledge, challenging its status, thinking critically about its methods as well as its results. We are already in a new era, perhaps too new and overwhelming to keep us from naming and claiming it yet. It is often easier to see what we are up against than it is to recognize how much we have already accomplished.

But it is time we did so. Our era has in common with other great turning points in civilization a combative, critical, creative spirit that lets loose and requires every resource of mind, of heart, of imagination, of courage we have and can develop. And how very different these qualities are from the qualities of mind and spirit characterizing the familiar safe sanctum of the absent-minded professor protected by academies offering unbreachable job security (because that is what tenure, which was designed to protect freedom of inquiry, has become). A feminist academy having critique as one of its animating attitudes will have to cherish not security but struggle. It is not the safe, the proven, who need protection. It is those who take risks. It will be a long time (a time that perhaps should not end) before feminism can be defined in any way that removes struggle from its very core. The feminist academy will have to protect struggle consciously and carefully, even when the struggle is within ourselves and with each other.

And that leads me to the second basic motion of feminism, the motion toward friendship. If the maintenance of struggle sounds like a paradoxical subject with which to bridge critique and friendship, it is indeed time we thought these things through.

I take friendship to be a relationship between equals and, unlike love, to be public more than private. It grows with being shared and cannot be betrayed by the taking of new people as friends because, unlike love, it is non-exclusive. It delights in difference, in separateness, demanding the honesty of full, mutual recognition, of seeing and being seen. Friendship, like the critical attitude, rejects the need to move in so close that we cannot be seen. It cherishes less than it admires, and comforts less than it challenges.

We need to examine the nature of friendship because--although thinkers of the stature of Aristotle long ago started writing about friendship--until recently only the friendship of men was considered. In being restricted to the private world for so long, women, like other oppressed groups, have been denied the

full experience of friendship (as our having for so long been excluded from higher education denied us the full development of our critical capacity). We have known intimacy, and we have highly developed practical intelligence, but until very recently indeed we have not been allowed the open space and the free time necessary to be friends and equals. Consequently, we are having to learn both when and how to stand up and be seen. We have had to learn to speak out in public, and we still often find it difficult to accept admiration and respect because we are so much more familiar with the nonjudgmental closeness of love. In public, where a smile cannot always soften a hard truth (and a hard truth from a woman evokes terror in men and charges of hostility rather than recognition of honesty); where being appealing is not as persuasive as being forceful; where being nice may count for far less than being effective, we are often ill at ease. We need these public experiences, and the strengths they require and build. Added to those we already have, they complete us: They make us truly able to be public as well as private people. But our world is not accustomed to such fully human people, and that women might emerge and demand our own space in the world has long terrified men. We will risk the genuine dangers that have always faced women who acted as if they were free people if we stand up now.

As feminists we have moved out and taken our own space; and as we have done so, we have also discovered friendship, have begun to learn to value distance and difference, and the struggle that always comes with them, as much as we value closeness. We have learned what the experience and not just the concept of equality means. Equality is not comforting like intimacy. It discovers and protects--cannot exist without--differences (it makes no sense to say that identical things are equal); and so, to be maintained, equality requires an honest and critical intelligence that evaluates, and that is not afraid of judgment.

Friendship and criticism go together, each being a condition for the other.

Those who teach women's studies already know how this argument relates to a discussion of a feminist academy. In a good women's studies course--a good feminist course--who we are, what we know and don't know, what we think and what we unknowingly assume emerge, are seen, are questioned, are challenged. We learn to be most critical of what seems most obvious, and to accept only what challenges us to be more than we have been allowed to be.

The feminist academy will be one in which the engagement of friends with friends is central. I keep repeating "friends" because I am also trying to substitute that kind of relationship for models taken from the family. I believe we should no longer be mothers and daughters, or even sisters, to each other any more than to our male teachers, colleagues, and students. Friendship is a relationship that is chosen, not a "natural" one. We are strong enough now not to need the coercive closeness of the family, of the private world, where inequality, not equality, is basic--the inequality of age, of dependence based on natural physical needs (and not-always-natural emotional needs).

Let me also emphasize that, like the turn of mind to feminist critique, the turn to friendship involves being willing to make judgments--something of which we have, rightly, been leery. It is time we stopped being protective

and did openly what we never stopped doing privately. Friendship asks us to raise questions, make selections, fight for what seems best; and in doing so to make every effort to be appropriate, to be sensitive to truth and to caring. We are called on to destroy distinctions that are harmful in order to make distinctions and judgments that are true, useful, meaningful. In this spirit, we will not mistake distinctions for judgments, or judgments for evaluations of worth: We will not assume that to say something or someone is different is simultaneously to say it or they are less. We will not mistake descriptions for prescriptions or vice versa: We will not assume that, for example, because a group of people can truly be described as powerless, it ought to be powerless. We will not assume that judgments proper to one specific area carry over to others: We will not assume, for example, that those who have more education are therefore smarter, or that those who make more money are worth more on any other scale.

What I am saying is that the crude intellectual distinctions and judgments behind racism, class prejudice, homophobia--and less obviously, perhaps, but just as surely, behind a great deal of what presently passes for knowledge in the non-feminist academy--are not only alien to the precise and questioning spirit of feminist critique, but also to the open and demanding caring of feminist friendship. People who seek truth, like people who seek friendship, not only are not cruel enough, but are not stupid enough to accept social stereotyping or the exploitation it creates and justifies. But we will make judgments and distinctions, because we want to be clear and to find and fight for what is good. We just won't do so stupidly.

Little by little, perhaps without our fully realizing it, as we have discovered the cleansing thrill of the question that opens everything up and the excitement of freely-chosen friendships, we have been transforming the academy. We have done more than we know. We know that we have added programs for women, taught old material in new ways, made it possible for new groups of people to join us. We also know that what we have done is not enough and is not at all safe, let alone established. Sometimes it seems as if we work all the time just to stay where we are. But in trying to do these things, even when we have lost, we have changed, we have changed others, and we have let loose a new spirit that will not go away.

How can we not know that? It cannot be our little programs that are making people so angry with us. It cannot be the extra work we do that exhausts us, because our tiredness is emotional as well as physical. It is time to stop reacting to the anger of others and clutching our (genuine) exhaustion to ourselves and recognize the fundamental changes--in ourselves, in our work situation, and in those around us--that we have made and are making all the time. What is exhilarating beyond exhaustion is the new life we are creating out of ourselves, out of our own struggles, and bringing into the dusky, divided corridors of good old dim and safe academia.

So that we may realize just how much we have done, let us think for a minute about what the non-feminist academy has been like.

Colleges have their place between the dark privacy of the home and the bright glare of the public world, thriving in a kind of half-light. They have been where young people (half-children, half-adults) were initiated into the

"community of educated people," meaning males, of course. And this initiation was carried out by adults, many of whom had themselves never left the half-light of the school room. For years, white male faculties guarded their peaceful world against intrusions from either the private or the public world. They fought desperately against having women in "their" world—women whom they saw only as mothers, wives, lovers, caretakers. They fought against having anyone who served them join them. Because we were so absolutely essential to their private bodily and emotional needs, we were profoundly embarrassing and threatening to them when we appeared before them, as people do in public, simply as people.

They fought, too, against the entrance of people from the public sphere. Experience has never counted in academia. In their world, in their academy, they wanted a space free from both the private and the political/public worlds. Only so, they thought, could they protect themselves from the threatening "darkness" and "femaleness" of "natural" needs, on the one hand, and the threatening "maleness" of the public world where only deeds counted. They called protecting themselves protecting the freedom to think. There is some truth in that, of course. Surely we do need time away from the pressures of both necessity and action if we are to think freely and fully. All of us need it. But equally surely the best, the greatest, thinking has been in touch with necessities, has been moved and inspired and torn by feelings, has been challenged and tested by action—not all at once, all the time, in every case, but sometimes, often at crucial times. The academy, wrapped in its tattered shreds of monastic scholasticism, trailing the religious and class and race and sex biases of its founders, has rarely been a place for passionate thought. How could it be, when so much and so many have been excluded? Protecting yourself takes too much time and energy to allow for real passion.

A feminist academy cannot be a retreat. In that fact alone lies a great deal of what is threatening about us. We have already pierced the half-light of the gentlemen by refusing to leave our feelings at home or our politics in the street, just as once we refused to be kept out of schools altogether. And we have also breached the walls of the monks' cells, the neat disciplinary and departmental structure of the retreat. In doing so, we have gone all the way back to the spirit of Diotima (from whom Socrates admits he learned his method): the spirit of questioning in the passionate light of Eros.

What does this radical change mean for teaching in a feminist academy? For one thing, it certainly means that the form of the classroom should follow its purpose rather than vice versa. That is not mysterious when we know what the purpose is, and by now we do. We ask of classes that they impart knowledge while raising critical questions; that they consciously explore rather than suppress the feeling and imaginative dimensions of knowing and thinking; that they help both students and teachers know themselves better for having talked together and met the people represented through the books and other material taught. We ask that our classes be more like intensely moving conversations than like workshops where masters train apprentices, or monasteries where priests initiate novices. Sometimes, our purposes will suggest that one person talk for awhile to give a model of consistent, coherent thinking; to cover basic information effectively; to make herself, her methods, assumptions, interests, passions, visible. Sometimes, they require discussion

so that there can be a mutuality in the interweaving of knowledge with analysis, of questioning with defending, and so that the teacher can find out not only what she has said but what has been heard.

We should be free to choose when we will work in which way; and we should add to this freedom the full recognition of our differences. Some people speak well, some lead discussions well, some can do both, some will develop new ways of teaching. If we care about excellence and about each other, we will help teachers work as they work best, because that is for everyone's benefit. The closed classroom doors of the present academy are guarded with a jealousy that can only spring from panic. Teachers today never learn to teach and usually spend their whole professional lives never having their prime career activity observed by a fellow professional. Consequently, in this, too, they are wasting a great deal of energy being protective. In a feminist academy, we will release that energy so that we can grow, can struggle out of the constraining molds into which we were forced during our long years of training. We will seek the help, the critical help, of our friends who teach with us as well as of our students. We will accept the frightening, liberating challenge of being seen.

What will we teach in our new ways? That is hard to say because we are still in the questioning and building stage. But already we have cracked the walls of the so-called disciplines, discovered that they are ways of knowing--tools--and that we can use them in new ways, ways that then help us redesign the tools themselves. What I mean is probably already very familiar to you. Think of what happened to history when we set out to look for women: We had to redefine the proper subject matter of history when we discovered not only where the women were, but how central to all of civilization-building were their activities--building and maintaining homes, communities, schools, hospitals, welfare agencies, the arts. It began to seem absurd to think only of politics, wars, and tariffs as the forces and controllers of what happened. You can fill in the rest for your own fields, and I know from last year's papers what good thinking along these lines you have already done.

We have whole new fields to develop, whole new sets of methods to define. What we are doing is comparable to Copernicus shattering our geo-centricity, Darwin shattering our species-centricity. We are shattering andro-centricity, and the change is as fundamental, as dangerous, as exciting. We will have to teach our new students and ourselves how to think, not just how to "master" what has already been prepared. We will have to develop in them--as we are developing in ourselves--strengths beyond those required of people except in times of major personal and cultural turmoil. Our teaching will demand independence and strength and rebelliousness as necessarily as the old teaching demanded acceptance and submission.

What do we do in the meantime, while the new strengths, the new tools, the new knowledge are growing? That, too, is not a real problem. At first, we will teach what we know, but now we will do so from our new perspective, in our new ways. Our teaching will also be our learning, and we will work on it together, using such familiar devices as team-teaching to help us work beyond our own disciplines, faculty seminars, and speakers or consultants from outside of the academy to help us evaluate both the substance and the process of our work. We will develop these devices, and others; and use them

comfortably, because we will have jettisoned the pervasive (though rarely acknowledged) notion that we should teach only what we learned in the past, as we learned it, if we are to be "respectable." At least part of the impulse behind teaching will have to change from the drive to exercise authority—to profess what one knows—to the desire to learn together. Like most revolutionary goals, that, too, is an old one—and a dangerous one. I say that because I do not want you to hear what I am saying as it has been said through the cliché-ridden years. We are making the half-light of the half-way house, the academy, a place of illumination that sheds light on both the public and the private, and those who protect the dark places in both are going to hate us for it. We are learning the honor there is in being hated by the right people. That is one of the most basic lessons that being public, being political, teaches.

And do not forget that in our academy we must get back to the most basic questions of all. To do so, we not only have to be critics, we have to bring into the realm of inquiry a fact about humans that has rarely been included among those we call basic: We are sexual creatures.

At the base of the complex edifice of our knowledge about ourselves as a species are certain givens: that humans are mortal, are rational, have five senses, have the use of language. All of these have been carefully studied in the name of self-knowledge. Assumptions about how these give us shape—and even set standards for human lives—underlie almost every statement made in any course, in any text. But that we are sexual, that we are male and female, has been ignored. "Human" has been taken to mean "male." We hear and say that a lot: Now let us face and never forget again just how fundamental an error it is. Our awareness that "man" does not include us is the touchstone by which we are transforming the academy—and our world.

Obviously, I do not mean that the differences between male and female have been ignored on a daily level. Quite the contrary. They have even been legislated. But they have not been examined, debated, or questioned with anything like the intensity and determination that, say, the equally basic facts of our rationality and our use of language have been. Precisely to the degree that we are obsessed by the supposed differences between "male" and "female" we have refused to question them. They are fraught with fear (sometimes I think it is the most basic fear of all—but that is too big and too important a topic for now).

In the continuing spirit of criticism, it is interesting to ask why our obvious sexuality has been so consistently ignored by those who have made it their business to know. I think it is because the oppression of the female is at the very heart of civilization. This is a strong statement and one it is time for us to think about very seriously. The differences between "male" and "female" as politically and socially defined have been so important to the maintenance of the prevailing order that they have been proclaimed non-political, non-academic, and "natural." That these differences are not natural is obvious if we look, for example, at those laws which force us to act "naturally" in our sexual relations. No one passes laws forcing us to use language, or have five senses, or be rational. Clearly, someone has been served and served well by the enforcement of the differences between the sexes as presently defined. Long-maintained contradictions usually point right at the heart of the matter, at what we are unwilling to face.

Let me give a parallel example. It is only now, when we no longer need to exploit animals for food, for shelter, for clothes, for amusement, that we are beginning to take the risk of discovering that they are not as fundamentally different in kind from us as we have thought. Not long ago at all it was heresy to suggest that the "dumb" beasts also have complicated systems of communication it is hard not to call languages. It was heresy to suggest that they are rational rather than ruled by the mysterious force we call "instinct," for that would have suggested that they have souls--which heaven forbid. Yet now, when we have finally realized how odd it is to study only animals that we have domesticated or imprisoned in laboratories and zoos, we are having to admit that they apparently do "figure things out" and do learn behavior we have long felt safer calling "instinctive." (I am always suspicious when people talk of "instincts"--like the "mothering instinct.") Only now, when we do not need to exploit animals, have we approached our knowledge about them critically and the animals themselves with something like friendship--that is, openly, with a willingness to see what is there without pre-judgment, prejudice.

I suggest that the parallel with the study of women (and of black people) is not at all far-fetched. As long as we were conditions for the life of men, it was too dangerous to their whole way of life and peace of mind for them to get to know us outside of our domesticated state. We are here now because something has already changed: It is not feminism and feminist scholarship that are threatening the old need--and dependency--based relationships between men and women and within the family. It is the destruction of--or our liberation from, if you prefer--the traditional family that has made feminism and our scholarship possible. Our traditional roles are not so necessary to simple survival any more, and so our oppression has become more visible (and not only to us--that is why many men are so anxious, and threatening, these days).

This was in part a digression, but of course it is not at all irrelevant. I am saying that our scholarship, what and how we teach in our academy, will have to go deeper not only than disciplinary but also than interdisciplinary, or multi-disciplinary, work can. As I said at the very beginning, we have to go back to the most basic levels of knowledge, the levels of definition and of metaphor, to shape what we will teach in our feminist academy. We will have to be philosophers and poets and scientists in all our scholarship, drawing on analysis, observation, empathy, and imagination in all that we do.

It is no accident that women's studies courses often develop internships, use journals as well as papers, include non-academicians as teachers, use supposedly outmoded techniques such as in-depth interviews rather than quantifiable "instruments," are turning to oral history--to people--as well as texts and other written resources. Nor is it any accident that many women's studies courses are problem- or topic-centered rather than being disciplinary or interdisciplinary.

*I once heard a white man who loved to go fishing say that black people (not his term) have a simply incredible "worm-digging instinct." A worm-digging instinct?! Clearly, he needed an explanation for the indigestible fact that some black people he knew were better at finding worms than he was.

We are already working in new ways. In a feminist academy, these ways will be central rather than peripheral. For example, I can see the familiar disciplinary studies being offered as supports, as service courses, for new, exploratory non-disciplinary classes whose topics change, develop, focus as the whole community moves in and out of them as teachers and as students.

We have also already begun to include the excluded as students, and who learns is certainly as important an issue for us as what is taught. Again, it is no accident that continuing education programs and women's studies have often been born together, or have supported each other. A recent study showed that returning women are now making up the majority of students in many women's studies courses. This coming together that breaks the mold of the "traditional" student is also radical and will have as far-reaching effects as the other changes we have considered. The "non-traditional" student started as an "add-on" just as the first "women-in-history" courses started as add-ons. Both have proceeded to transform the academy. Again--it is time we saw and claimed what we are doing.

Just think for a minute: The academy has long been a place for people who could afford leisure ("scholar" derives from "scholia," the Latin for "leisure"). The fact that financial aid has been available only for full-time students is a direct reflection of this bias that reaches all the way back to the Greek view that only what is an end in itself--is useless--is of real value. Women and workers were long excluded from the vote and from education for the same reason: Ours was toil that necessity imposes. We were the conditions for the life and status of men, and the freedom of privileged men. To hold schools as they are, built for full-time students, is to hold them within a tradition that serves only those whose needs are taken care of by others.

We know that the people who want to learn are the students we want to teach and that having been a mother does not incapacitate you from learning, that working with your hands does not destroy your head, that doing more than one thing in your life does not mark you as inferior any more than being useful makes you inferior. We have already changed: We welcome all who want to learn. And we do so for selfish reasons as well as on principle. We--all of us--need all the help we can get if we are to break out of our cultural, class, race, and sex biases. We need critics among us.

And this openness to the challenge of including new people does something else for us. It forces the de-institutionalization of the school. We will have to offer classes at different hours, provide day care as routinely as we provide mixers and football games, and welcome part-time teachers and administrators as we are finally beginning to welcome part-time students. We will have to let form follow purpose here, too. The fetishes of the nine-to-five day, of single-use space, of rank and hierarchy will simply have to go. We can't afford these barriers to the realization of our purposes.

And again, as I did after talking about breaking down intellectual and personal barriers in the spirit of feminist criticism and friendship, I have to add that we do so not to give up making distinctions or judgments or setting standards but in order to do so sanely, intelligently. If we want good learners to be among us, we should look for them wherever we can find

them. If we want the best possible teachers, we should find them wherever they are and be flexible enough to shape working conditions for them. If we want to study the greatest minds and spirits, and the best of the products of our civilization, we need to look for them--and to be willing to recognize them when we find them, even if that means changing our long-unquestioned models. Do you know that even Simone de Beauvoir wrote that Middlemarch simply isn't as great as The Brothers Karamazov because it was written by a woman? Women, she wrote, simply do not have the "greatness of soul" of men. How curious that the people who have dealt with life and death and sickness and love and healing and caring are all uniformly crippled in soul, while the people who have made wars, built economic empires, run inquisitions, exploited all who served their needs are those among whom all greatness resides. Surely we are not rejecting standards when we reject such nonsense. And of course we will make judgments. Some things and some people and some ways of doing things are always better than others in certain specifiable ways. The point is to know what those ways are, and then to avoid the sloppy intellectual error and the cruel human act that makes of a specific judgment a general one. What we will not do in our feminist academy is to mistake one kind of excellence for excellence itself.

Think for a minute of the idiocies of which we have already rid ourselves (an activity that infallibly provokes some people to attack us for rejecting "standards.") We are too intelligent to believe that "human" means "male"; that learning is the same as wisdom; that the excellence of any one kind of work can be made the standard for all; that people who can afford to do only one thing with their lives are better than those who must do many; that what is useless is better than what is useful; that critical analysis is male and intuition female; that love is effeminate and friendship masculine; that what has been, should be. Minds and hearts that are bound by errors such as these are literally crippled, but we want full growing people in our academy. We transform the academy by naming errors, not merely to dismiss them, but so we are free to move beyond them.

Will we make it? Is it possible to de-institutionalize education, to support and preserve the struggle of critical friendship, and to do so without ourselves creating a new orthodoxy? Probably not. The sadly familiar destruction-creation-protection-persecution rhythm of change may well catch us, too. But that is all right. We do not seek to found a new order; we seek to find a new way to be, to think, to live freely--and that means we welcome change and struggle and can admit failure in order to avoid being stopped by it. And when we look at what we have already become, beyond what we have done, it is clear that more is possible than anyone wants us to know. It is time we knew it. The feminist academy, the academy transformed, is not some edifice awaiting us in the far future. It is here now when we work together, knowing that our work comes directly out of who we are, even as it moves us toward who we want to be. The transformed academy is us at our best--all of us, working to be sure that none of us is trivialized, ignored, excluded or oppressed any longer. We have come out--a phrase that applies to us all--and we are not going back in.

HAVE WOMEN ALWAYS BEEN UNEQUAL?
Rita Smith Kipp, Kenyon College

This paper greatly condenses recent anthropological research and controversy on women's status. It is merely an introduction to these materials, intended especially for non-anthropologists. The bibliography includes some of the major review articles on this topic where a reader, if interested, can find extensive references to the primary materials from which the controversies and generalizations are being fed. I have divided this paper into several sections. First, I explain why the question, "Have Women Always been Unequal?" is an important one. Next, I stress that this issue is more complicated than it may initially appear to be. Finally, after outlining three answers anthropologists have given to this question, I indicate which of them I find most persuasive.

Anthropology surprises us now and then by showing us that something we had assumed to be natural or inevitable is really only an artifact of our culture. Margaret Mead's work often accomplished this, showing us, for example, that for Samoan girls, adolescence was not a time of awkwardness and identity crisis, but was rather a pleasant and exciting stage of life (Mead 1928). Again, from her work in New Guinea, we learned that the personality we label "feminine" was, in one society, characteristic of both males and females; in another society, characteristic of neither males and females; and in still a third society, characteristic of males rather than females (Mead 1935). The usefulness of these surprises is, of course, that we begin to see that the particular problems of our society—turbulent adolescence, or the pressures of women to act feminine at the expense of developing their minds and bodies—are not inevitable and so can be changed.

In the women's movement we have an overall conviction that sexual inequality is neither inevitable nor unchangeable; but sometimes the difficulty of our struggle invites doubt. What a boon it would be, in times of frustration and despair, or when facing the skepticism of others, if we could confidently point to a time in history, or to some other society, in which women and men were equal. This example would bolster both our arguments and our spirits. Beyond that, such information would also help resolve one of the major splits within feminist theory: the split between socialist feminism and radical feminism.

Socialist feminism argues that the root of sexual inequality is economic inequality, i.e., that the existence of capitalism and the division of societies into classes bring about the economic and social inequality of men and women. Engels (1878) first elaborated this argument. He suggested that, although there was a sexual division of labor in pre-capitalist societies, the different work of men and women was equally valued. Life was lived in communal groups in which there were no recognizable nuclear families and no

private ownership of property. Men obtained food for the group as a whole, women processed it for the group—both tasks equal and interdependent. Only when private ownership of property became possible did men become concerned with being able to specify with certainty who their children, the heirs to their property, were. Thus, argued Engels, monogamy and the family came into existence. As men became increasingly involved in the accumulation and exchange of property, their political and economic roles increasingly differed in quality from those of women. Men's labor enmeshed them in larger and more public social relations (markets, businesses, etc.) while women's labor (producing heirs and processing food) kept them in the privacy of the home. Men's production for exchange, carried out in the public realm, was more valued and admired than women's production for subsistence in the home. Man became the master; woman, his domestic servant.

Engels' reconstruction of life in pre-capitalist societies was based on the best anthropological knowledge of his era, but anthropology has really developed only since Engels' time. How does his argument look today, with one hundred years of anthropological research, much of it in pre-capitalist societies, behind us? Are women and men equal in the absence of capitalism? If so, our directive, as feminists, is to work for the demise of capitalism, so that equality for the sexes will also be ours.

Opposing this argument and this directive, however, is radical feminism. Here, the term "radical" is used in the sense of "root" or "basic." The assumption of radical feminism is that sexual inequality is more basic, more fundamental, than class or capitalism and is historically prior to them. Can anthropology confirm this? Do women in pre-capitalist societies also occupy a subordinate status? Is the status of women under contemporary socialism also subordinate to that of men? If the answers to these questions are yes, then capitalism is not the cause of sexual inequality and socialism is not its cure. The directive, then, is to change sexual inequality first, and with that most radical of changes, perhaps other inequalities such as those based on race and class will also be undermined.

Why the Question is Complex

There is a theoretical dispute here that needs a factual resolution, but, like any question of theory, the nature of the dispute complicates the answer by contributing to the difficulty of gathering conclusive facts. Facts, after all, are usually matters of interpretation and the interpretive process is shaped by our presuppositions. Anthropologists committed to socialist feminism or socialism will be predisposed to interpret the status of women in primitive societies as equal to that of men, or at least more nearly equal than is the case in capitalist societies. Radical feminists, presupposing that sexual inequality is more basic to the human condition than economic inequality, will interpret the same "facts" of life in primitive societies as demonstrating their viewpoint.

The complexity of the question does not end here. You can't get very far in interpreting facts without some clarification of terms. What is "inequality"—how do we recognize and measure it? In part, this is a question of whether we

should use a subjective measure or an objective one. A subjective measure would indicate that the sexes are unequal if people in the society in question say that this is the case. But what if men say women are inferior and are under male authority, while women dismiss this as mere men's talk? Such cases have been reported! What if the people in question perceive an inequality of the sexes, but we perceive it otherwise? Susan Rogers (1975) suggests that in many peasant societies, both sexes say that males are dominant, and males do receive public symbolic deference. Nevertheless, Rogers argues, this male dominance, as reflected in decision-making processes, power, and autonomy, is often a myth.

Perhaps, then, we should ignore the subjective element, and arm ourselves instead with a set of objective criteria (cf. Friedl 1975). Are women participants in production? Do they control any economic distribution outside their nuclear families? Are women leaders in ritual or politics? Do they have autonomy in decisions about their own lives—marriage, sex, divorce, reproduction? Why should we not use these measures to look at other societies? Women's disadvantaged position in the labor market, their lack of autonomy, their relative absence from positions of prominence—these are evidence of women's inequality in our society, regardless of the fact that many women do not feel disadvantaged, do not subjectively acknowledge their position as inferior. As feminists, we know that sexual inequality pervades all our lives, whether or not we are conscious of it.

But consider again these objective measures. How objective, or culture-free, are they? By measuring other peoples by what we value, do we not run the risk of distorting their lives—lives based on different values and assumptions? I recall a women's center discussion table at our campus on the topic of Third World men and women. Two male students from different African countries, a female student from India, and others there became frustrated with our feminism. "You don't understand us," they pleaded. "You don't understand how life is in my country." And I'm sure they were right. I lived for a year and a half in a small village in highland Sumatra and faced endless frustration when answering people's questions about life in my society. I could see that they could not comprehend, and that their understanding was distorted by the assumptions and values of their culture.

Some anthropologists point out that the very question we ask—have women always been unequal?—reflects our society's values and its unresolved problems. Equality is a Western concept, and may not even be easily translated in many languages. Where societies are not divided into economic classes, where political structures are non-centralized and not as hierarchical as ours, "equality" is seldom an issue. This is the point Karen Sacks (1976) makes: in societies with state-level political systems, most human relationships are interpreted as hierarchical relationships of dominance-subordination. We look at husband-wife, parent-child, teacher-student, and countless other relationships in these terms, and, she argues, we are likely to apply these same standards when we study roles and relationships in other societies. Not only have anthropologists assumed they would find male dominance and studied male activities because of the male bias of our culture, but they also have a "state-bias" that predisposes them to see hierarchy in human relations. In egalitarian pre-state societies, hierarchy is not a pervasive dimension of social relations, and differences between people

are not seen as hierarchical relations of inequality. Some anthropologists (e.g., Schlegel 1977; Briggs 1974; Leacock 1978) argue that women's roles in the societies they studied, while very different from those of men, were not unequal to them.

How the Question has been Answered

Eleanor Leacock, a socialist feminist, is one of the most persistent and persuasive of those who argue that woman's position was equal to man's in some pre-state societies, especially those most egalitarian societies, hunter-gatherers in mobile "bands." Bands are units in which there is no separation of the private domestic realm from the public one, for life is lived in the public sphere, the domestic residential group being synonymous with the larger group that constitutes the community. In these societies, she argues, social relations are qualitatively different from those in state-level societies. There is no economic specialization requiring exchange, so producers themselves control economic relations. Decisions are made by those who carry them out. In societies such as these, Leacock argues, the different economic roles of men and women are equal. Likewise, in group decision-making and in the decisions regarding their own lives, women are equal to men.

There are other anthropologists who take an opposing view. They suggest that although the degree of inequality varies considerably and women do have higher status in some societies (especially egalitarian societies) than in others, their position relative to men is, nonetheless, always subordinate and therefore unequal. A frequently-cited statement of this position is by Michelle Rosaldo (1974). Her argument, which has parallels to Engels', is that the inequality of women stems from the separation of public and private spheres of life. The greater participation of males in the public sphere is the source of their greater authority and status. Women, on the other hand, are associated with the private, or domestic, sphere, partly because of reproductive and mothering roles. (Obviously, Leacock's argument that in some societies there is no public-private dichotomy is directed to Rosaldo.)

Finally, there are those anthropologists who, because of the difficulties already mentioned, despair of taking a position on the question. A list of those difficulties includes the following: (1) most anthropologists, in collecting their data, have assumed male dominance, and, as a corollary, that women's lives and activities are not worth mentioning; (2) our theoretical assumptions and biases, both feminist and anthropological, predispose us to interpret the same facts quite differently; (3) as members of state-level societies, we may see hierarchy and inequality where there is perhaps only difference; (4) there are very few remaining representatives of peoples who live totally outside the influence and domination of state-level societies and who are free from the economic relations with them which create inequality (Leacock 1978). It is no wonder, then, that some declare, like Sharon Tiffany (1978) in a recent overview, that at this stage we cannot make pronouncements on universal subordination and inequality for women. As she says, "... assertions of dominance and subordination are too simplistic for comparative understanding of the rich diversity and complexity of female-male relationships in various societies" (1978:46). Similarly, Naomi Quinn (1977), in an extensive review, dismisses any attempts to make general

assessments--as well as to pinpoint a single cause--of women's status. She suggests that the different dimensions of women's status--political participation, informal power, personal autonomy, economic participation--may vary independently of each other and may have different causal bases. We should look at each dimension separately rather than make general pronouncements about the status of women in a particular society (or all societies).

In spite of the pitfalls of taking a stand, I will. The radical feminists are more nearly correct, I think, than the socialist feminists. To me, the widespread subordination and inequality of women is more impressive than the rare, if existent, exceptions. Certainly, in the majority of societies, state and pre-state alike, woman's overall position relative to man's is not equal--although equality is more nearly achieved in some societies than in others--and the ways in which men and women are unequal also vary. (I recognize, of course, that this judgment is my Western-biased view of other lives, and that the sexual hierarchy I perceive may not appear hierarchical from the insiders' perspective.) I take this position, not only on the evidence of inequality in pre-capitalist societies, but also on the evidence of women's status in socialist countries. For example, the official position in the Soviet Union is to deny that sexual inequality exists, although women are conspicuously absent from positions of leadership, and, in the domestic realm, are far from parity with their husbands (Rosenthal 1975). In a socialist democracy like Sweden, there are impressive laws and policies supporting sexual equality, but again, the position of women in the labor market and the division of labor in families is evidence of much remaining inequality (Barrett 1977). Some of the most rapid and impressive gains for women have been achieved in the People's Republic of China. These gains have happened because officials are willing to admit there is a problem that will take a lot of effort to change. It may well be that capitalism, while not the whole root of sexual inequality, does exacerbate it, and that socialist countries can more easily move toward resolving inequality. Nonetheless, the fact that, even in socialist countries, special efforts have to be mounted to redress the problem shows that socialism does not automatically eliminate sexual inequality.

Although siding here with the radical feminists and with the side which sees the subordination of women as virtually universal, I am not a pessimist. I do not think that what has always been must necessarily always be. We cultural anthropologists are continually reminded by our colleagues in archaeology and physical anthropology that humanity's development predates the five or six thousand years of written history by literally millions of years. Obviously, again and again throughout this long development, social and cultural innovations have occurred. If you had been on Earth ten thousand years ago, as a visitor from another planet, you would have found no societies with centralized governments, no societies with class differences based on differential access to wealth. At that time, if you had based your projections for the future social organization of this planet on the previous million years of existence, you would have concluded that state-level social and political structures were an impossibility. In other words, wholly new social structures have evolved and been created throughout our existence; and if we do not destroy ourselves, this creative process will continue. The generative process of cultural evolution will go on for as long as humanity itself exists.

In conclusion, although I acknowledge that establishing sexual equality will require a truly radical alteration of the human condition, I believe that equality not only can be achieved, but is already being achieved, if only in very limited ways. Like any other radical change, this transition may take a while. When we turn to anthropology to support our hopes and arguments that sexual equality is possible, we need not be dismayed by what--in virtually all times and places--has been. Rather, we can point to other evidence, equally abundant in the anthropological record: the great human capacity for creativity and change. In fact, as feminists, we are the best living evidence of the change toward sexual equality, even as we are also part of the creative force bringing it into being.

References Cited

- Barrett, Nancy. 1977. Have Swedish Women Achieved Equality? In *Woman in a Man-made World*. Nona Glazer and Helen Y. Waehrer, eds. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Briggs, Jean. 1974. Eskimo Women: Makers of Men. In *Many Sisters: Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. C. J. Matthiasson, ed. pp. 261-304. New York: Free Press.
- Engels, Friedrich. (1878) 1972. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. New York: International Publishers.
- Friedl, Ernestine. 1975. *Women & Men: An Anthropologist's View*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Leacock, Eleanor. 1978. Women's Status in Egalitarian Societies: Implications for Social Evolution. *Cur. Anth.* 19:247-75.
- Mead, Margaret. 1928. *Coming of Age in Samoa*. New York: William Morrow.
- Mead, Margaret. 1935. *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*. New York: William Morrow.
- Quinn, Naomi. 1977. Anthropological Studies on Women's Status. *Ann. Rev. of Anth.* 6:131-225.
- Rogers, Susan. 1975. Female Forms of Power and the Myth of Male Dominance: A Model of Female/Male Interaction in Peasant Society. *Am. Ethnol.* 2:727-56.
- Rosaldo, Michelle. 1974. Woman, Culture and Society: A Theoretical Overview. In *Woman, Culture, and Society*. L. Lamphere and M. Rosaldo, eds. Stanford University Press.
- Rosenthal, Bernice G. 1975. The Role and Status of Women in the Soviet Union: 1917- the Present. In *Women Cross-Culturally: Change and Challenge*. Ruby Rohrlich-Leavitt, ed. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sacks, Karen. 1976. State Bias and Women's Status. *Am. Anth.* 78:565-69

Schlegel, Alice. 1972. Male Dominance and Female Autonomy: Domestic Authority in Matrilineal Society. New Haven: Human Relations Area Press.

Schlegel, Alice. 1977. Sexual Stratification: A Cross-Cultural View. New York: Columbia.

Tiffany, Sharon. 1978. Models and the Social Anthropology of Women: A Preliminary Assessment. Man 13:34-51.

THE FEMINIST ACADEMY AND THIRD WORLD WOMEN
Nellice Gillespie-Woltemade, Ohio State University

When I was asked to participate on a panel discussing education of Third World women at the GLCA conference on "A Feminist Transformation of the Academy," I considered the ways in which the two are related. Rather than prepare a report on the education of women in a specific country, I chose to address the broader question: "How is the idea of a feminist transformation of the academy related to Third World women?"

The term "Third World women" is value laden and implies a hierarchy of First, Second, and Third worlds. It is used here in recognition of the Third World Women's Caucus in the National Women's Studies Association—which was founded in 1977. Attempting to use any single term to include the diversity of women here considered is problematic at best. "Women of color" seems to be a recent attempt. I mean to include all women who have suffered or are suffering from colonialism and imperialism and their aftermath. I will use the term "Third World women" in this inclusive sense.

A feminist transformation of the academy means confronting our cultural biases and racism as well as sexism. We must consider the question posed above at the levels of (1) the individual student and scholar, (2) our departments, (3) our academic disciplines, and (4) our educational institutions. We need to consider both American women of color and women from other countries (those temporarily here in the United States and those in their home lands). Let us look at each level separately:

(1) The Individual Student and Scholar

We must first of all recognize and deal with our own ignorance of Third World women and how our cultural imperialism affects our view of feminism, women's studies, and Western values. We must struggle against our own racism and ethnocentrism and avoid projecting white middle-class interpretations onto Third World women, their sex roles, and realities. Care must be taken not to blame the victims, assuming that consequences of their oppression are aspects of the culture of Third World women. For example, lead poisoning of children is a consequence of oppression—children eat lead paint flaking off the walls of a ghetto apartment. There is a tendency to explain the resultant deaths and damaged brains on a "lack of concern" on the part of ghetto mothers, rather than blame the slumlords and lax safety inspectors responsible for these conditions. For an excellent discussion of this tendency, see: "Culture, Feminist Racism, and Feminist Classism: Blaming the Victim," by Hope Landrine, in Off Our Backs, November, 1979, pages 2 and 3.

We must assess our own level of knowledge—or lack of it. What do we actually know about Third World women in this country—for example, Native Americans,

Chicanas, black women, Asian Americans, and the Appalachian poor—and how racism and classism oppress their lives? What do we actually know about Third World countries and cultures? What do we know about issues important to women in these countries: nutrition, infant mortality, literacy, health care, family planning, child care, employment...or suttee, dowry, rights of widows, purdah, clitoridectomy, polygyny, infant formula, wearing the veil, rights of divorce? What does it mean to deal with such issues in a social context of poverty, expanding population, and cultural and religious tradition?

Consider, too, the special problems of immigrant women, such as Asian, African, and Caribbean women in Britain; Turkish and Greek women in Germany; and Vietnamese women in the United States. Their problems are compounded by culture shock, racism expressed against them, separation from their families, language difficulties, and discrimination in housing and jobs.

Gaining insights into these issues will mean additional study on our part. We need to understand the political, social, economic, and religious institutions of the various cultures—within their historical context. It will also mean learning from Third World women and listening to them.

(2) Departments

We should evaluate our curricula and course content. Where and how can the issues of Third World women and pertinent materials best be incorporated: in Sociology of Women, Anthropology, Economic Development, History, Art...? How do we respond to attitudes of those colleagues who are not dealing with women in their courses and especially the issues of Third World women? And further, how can we change this pattern of exclusion? Both students and colleagues should challenge such faculty to develop new courses and programs, choose inclusive texts, and revise course syllabi. It will also mean a specific effort to recruit Third World women students and faculty into our departments.

(3) Disciplines

Are we familiar with the current research and writing in our disciplines about and by Third World women? Do our academic conferences and journals include such research? The women's caucuses of the professional associations to which we belong must be vigilant on the importance of including Third World women in the disciplines. Library holdings (books, journals, bibliographies, films) in our disciplines must provide research materials on Third World women. Upgrading library holdings and subscriptions is essential to any effort to expand women's studies in general and especially on the topic of Third World women. Budget allocations must be sufficient in women's studies where so many of the pertinent journals and other materials are new.

(4) The Institution

We must strive for greater inclusion of Third World women in the planning and development of university programs and curriculum. Third World women should be represented in lecture/artist series, women's services, research colloquia, and other campus events. We must accept the responsibility of analyzing the current level of awareness of Third World women's issues and the quality of such programs.

Institutional resources will have to be committed and funding must be sought for faculty development and preparation of materials and bibliographies on Third World women. These efforts should not be seen as temporary; rather, change in awareness of Third World women and inclusion of them in our teaching must be the goal.

Are there Third World women (foreign and American women of color) in our campus communities—and how concerned are we about them? For example, if there are students from Third World countries, how many are women? Why aren't more of them women, and how should our recruitment address this imbalance? Has any effort been made to reach the wives of male students from abroad to determine and serve their needs? Are special courses needed for them? Also, how can we draw upon them as resource persons to learn firsthand about women in Third World countries? Perhaps discussion groups involving these women could be started. What about other minority women in the community or nearby? Innovative programs reaching out to non-traditional students should be developed involving Third World women of all ages.

There is a need for more travel and two-way exchanges between the United States and Third World countries, so that American students and faculty can learn firsthand about Third World women from them. More Third World women students and faculty should visit our campuses for study and teaching. International study programs offer opportunities and resources for the study of women. Contact should be made with women in these countries to facilitate more feminist research.

A truly feminist transformation of the academy requires the growth of interest in and knowledge of fields other than our own. It often requires interdisciplinary work, which gives us new insights and perspectives into that which we "already know." Such new vision has caused much of the excitement connected with women's studies. Sometimes this new insight leads to anger and outrage, such as that surrounding repressive sterilization of American women of color or the exploitative policies of some U. S. and European companies and government development programs—such as the marketing of infant formula and the distribution of dangerous contraceptives in Third World countries. Do our political and theoretical models—like "modernization," "progress," "growth economy," and "development"—overlook the active participation of women in the economy, the political system, and movements for social change? We need to understand better the combined effects of racism and sexism often underlying immigration and other policies concerning developments in Third World countries, and then challenge those national policies which exploit women. We must accept responsibility for the policies of our country and of our educational institutions as they affect women through export of goods, aid, investment and buying, wars, technical and military assistance, and research and communication.

We must learn not to speak on behalf of Third World women or to impose Western interpretations and judgments on such complex cultural phenomena as, for example, clitoridectomy. Rather, we must support Third World feminists' own attempts to bring about cultural change. We must learn to stop thinking of Third World women as "subjects" of our research and recognize them as collaborators and teachers.

Finally, we should be responsive to and enriched by the beauty and poetry of the diverse lives of women in other cultures and American women of color. We need to respect the autonomy and self-determination of all women, not impose our forms of feminism on them. Only through a two-way exchange of values, ideas, and skills can we begin to correct the distortions we have been taught and bring about a truly feminist transformation of the academy for all women.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: This is offered as a beginning list of resource materials on Third World women. It is limited to a few academic areas, but will give some idea of the types of resources available. I would like to thank Dr. Margaret R. Fete, Ohio Wesleyan University, for her contributions.

Andreski, Iris. Old Wives' Tales: Life-Stories of African Women. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Appadorai, Dr. A. (ed). Status of Women in South Asia. Washington, D. C.: Zenger Publishing Co., 1978.

Ba'labakki, Layla. Je vis. Paris: Seuil, 1961. (Available in English: I live, and in Arabic: Ana Ahys.)

_____. "Nous, sans masques." Orient, 11. Paris, 1959.

Beck, Lois and Nikkie Keddie. Women in the Muslim World. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1978.

Bergen, Arlene Eisen. Women of Vietnam. San Francisco: People's Press, 1975.

Black Women in Transition (1978 Conference papers on educational and economic status) Free: Center for Continuing Education of Women. University of Michigan, 330 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48109.

Blicksilver, Edith (ed). The Ethnic-American Woman: Problems, Protests, Lifestyles. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1978.

Boserup, Ester. Women's Role in Economic Development. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.

Boulding, Elise. The Underside of History: A View of Women Through Time. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1976.

* Buvinic, Mayra. Women and World Development: An Annotated Bibliography. Overseas Development Council, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1976.

Caplan, Patricia, and Janet M. Bujra (eds). Women: Comparative Studies of Ten Contemporary Cultures. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1979.

La civilisation de la femme dans la tradition africaine. Proceedings of meeting organized by Societe Africaine de culture, held in Abidjan (Ivory Coast) July, 1972. Presence Africaine. Paris, 1975.

Communications Media for Third World Women. The United Presbyterian Women have 4 ethnic caucuses: Asian, Black, Latina, and Native American. Quarterly newsletter Plumline, filmstrips, and study guides: "What We're All About," plus Third World Women's Skills Bank. Available from Concern, 454 Interchurch Center, 475 Riverside Dr., New York, New York 10027.

Conditions: Five. The Black Women's Issue. 1979 (PO Box 56, Van Brunt Station, Brooklyn, New York, 11215.)

Cornelison, Ann. Women of the Shadows: The Wives and Mothers of Southern Italy. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Cotera, Martha P. The Chicana Feminist. Texas: Information Systems Development, 1977.

. Diosa Y. Hembra: The History and Heritage of Chicanas in the United States. Texas: Statehouse Printing, No. 16.

Country Women. Special issue on International Women. Issue No. 30, August, 1978. (Box 51, Albion, California 95410)

Critique of Anthropology. Women's Issue. Vol 3, 9 & 10 (double issue) 1977. (PO Box 178, London WC1 E 6BU, England)

Croll, Elisabeth. Feminism and Socialism in China. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

De Chungara, Domitila Barrios and Moema Viezzer. Let Me Speak. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978.

Development Digest. Vol XVII, No. 1, January 1979. Special issue on women. Agency for International Development.

Diarra, Fatoumata-Agnes. Femmes Africaines en devenir: les femmes zarma du Niger. Paris: Anthropos, 1971.

Djebar, Assia. Les femmes de l'Islam. (also in translation in Jean MacGibbon. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd, 1961.)

de Dwyer, Cardenas. Chicano Voices. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Dwyer, Daisy. Images and Self-images: Male and Female in Morocco. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

The Ethnic Woman, Spring/Summer, 1978. (PO Box 903, FDR Station, New York 10022 or PO Box 459, Cooper Union Station, New York, 10003.)

"Des femmes sur l'Afrique des femmes," Cahiers d'etudes africaines, # 65, Vol XVII, 1977, le cahier. (Journal of essays by and about African women trained in many disciplines.)

- Ferneau, Elizabeth Warnock. Guests of the Sheikh: An Ethnography of an Iraqi Village. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1965.
- _____, and Basima Qattan Bezirgan. Middle Eastern Muslim Women Speak. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1977.
- Friedl, Ernestine. Women and Men: An Anthropologist's View. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Gordon, David C. Women of Algeria: An Essay on Change. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Hafkin, Nancy J. and Edna Bay. Women in Africa: Studies in Social and Economic Change. Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Hamili, Gisele. "De l'Islam, des femmes et de la revolution en general," Le monde, 21 mars, 1978.
- * Heresies: A Feminist Publication on Art and Politics. Third World Women: The Politics of being other (special issue) Vol 2, No. 4, Issue 8. 1979 (has resource bibliography)
- Iglitzin, Lynne B. and Ruth Ross (eds). Women in the World: Studies in Comparative Politics # 6. Santa Barbara: Clio Books, 1976.
- ISIS. Women's International Information and Communication Service. Resource guides: Bottle Babies: A Guide to the Baby Foods Issue.
Women in Development: A Resource Guide
Quarterly International Bulletin: No. 1, The International Tribunal on Crimes Against Women (Brussels) March, 1976.
 (Via della Pelliccia 31, 00153 Rome, Italy or P. O. Box 301, CH 1227 Carouge/Geneva, Switzerland).
- _____. International Bulletin No. 11, Spring 1979: Women, Land and Food Production.
- * Jacobs, Sue-Ellen. Women in Perspective: A Guide for Cross-Cultural Studies. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1976. (Bibliography/source book).
- Jones, Rex L. and Shirley Kurz Jones. The Himalayan Woman. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1976.
- Lavrin, Asuncion (ed). Latin American Women: Historical Perspective. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Lemu, B. Aisha and Fatima Heeren. Woman in Islam. London: Islamic Council of Europe, 1978.
- Lerner, Gerda (ed). Black Women in White America: A Documentary History. New York: Vintage Books, 1972.
- Little, Kenneth. African Women in Towns. Cambridge University Press, 1973.

- Ly, Madeleine. Introduction a une psychanalyse africaine. Paris: Librairie le Francois, 1948.
- Maher, Vanessa. Women and Property in Morocco. Cambridge University Press.
- Makward, Edris (compiler) and Leslie Lacy. Contemporary African Literature. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Martin, M. K. and B. Voorhies. Female of the Species. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Matthiasson, Carol (ed). Many Sisters: Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Mernissa, Fatima. Beyond the Veil. Male-Female Dynamics in a Modern Muslim Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Schenkman Publishing Co., 1975.
- M'Rabet, Fadela. La femme algerienne (followed by: Les Algeriennes.) Paris: Maspéro, 1969.
- * Morrow, Margot. A Cross-Cultural Study of Women. Women's Studies Curriculum Development Project, University of Michigan, 1977. Contains bibliographies and course modules on: Male Dominance, Women and Economics, Women and Religion, Area studies: South Asian Women, Women in China, Melanesia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Islamic Middle East and North Africa.
- National Hispanic Feminist Conference (First National Meeting, March, 1980). Project Director: Dr. Sylvia Gonzales, Business Tower 456, San Jose State University, San Jose, California, 95192.
- Nelson, Nici. "Why has Development Neglected Rural Women? A Review of the South Asian Literature," Women in Development Vol I. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979.
- Newland, Kathleen. The Sisterhood of Man. New York: W.W. Norton, 1979.
- Nzugi, Baleka Bamba. "Que signifie au juste la liberation feminine?" Cultures 1, 1973, in: Revue Zairoise des Sciences de l'Homme, Office Nationale de la recherche et du developpement.
- Papanek, Hanna. "Purdah in Pakistan: Seclusion of Modern Occupations for Women," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 33, No. 3 (August) pp. 517-530. 1971.
- _____. "Purdah: Separate Worlds and Symbolic Shelter," Comparative Studies in Society and History. 15: 289-325, 1973.
- Patai, Raphael (ed). Women in the Modern World. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Paulme, Denise (ed). Femmes d'Afrique noire. Paris: Mouton, 1960. (translated by H. M. Wright, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.)

- Reiter, R.R. (ed). Toward an Anthropology of Women. New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- * Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation Sur La Recherche Feministe. Vol VIII, No. 3 Part 2, November, 1979. "Women and the Politics of Culture" (articles and reviews) Department of Sociology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S1V6
- The Review of Radical Political Economics. "Women and the Economy." Vol * No. 1, Spring 1976. (URPE, 41 Union Square West, Room 901, New York 10003.)
- * Rihani, May. Development as if Women Mattered: An Annotated Bibliography with a Third World Focus. Occasional Paper No. 10, Overseas Development Council, 1717 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Washington D.C., 20036, April 1978 (\$3.00)
- Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist and Louise Lamphere (eds). Woman, Culture and Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- * Saulniers, Suzanne Smith and Cathy A. Rakowski. Women in the Development Process: A Select Bibliography on Women in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. Texas: Texas Press, 1977.
- Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. Special Issue: Women and National Development. Vol 3, No. 1, Autumn, 1977.
- _____. Vol 5, No. 1, Autumn, 1979. Special section: Women in Latin America.
- Sociologia Ruralis. Vol XVIII, No. 2/3 1978. Special Issue on: "The Special Role of Women in Rural Society." Van Gorcum, PO Box 43, 9400 AA Assen, Holland (\$10).
- Sources of Strength: Women and Culture. High School Course (Teacher's guide, bibliography, and 2 cassette tapes—\$20) EDC/WEEAP, 39 Chapel St., Newton, Mass. 02160 (Covers Nigeria, China, African Americans, and Asian American women).
- Sow, Fatou. "Dependance et developpement en Afrique: le statut de la femmes en Afrique contemporaine," Notes Africaines (IFAN: Dakar) #139, July 1972.
- _____. "Les femmes et les valeurs dans la societe senegalaises actuelle," Encyclopedia des Cultures Africaines, UNESCO, August, 1976.
- Sterling, Dorothy. Black Foremothers. New York: The Feminist Press, 1979.
- Thiam, Awa. La Parole aux negresses. Paris: Grasset, 1978.
- Tillion, Germaine. "Les femmes et le voile dans la civilisation mediterraneenne," Etudes Maghrebines, Paris, 1964.

_____. Le Harem et les cousin. Paris: Seuil, 1966.

- * Tinker, Irene and Michele Bo Bramsen (eds). Women and World Development. Overseas Development Council, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1976.

Virago Limited. Finding a Voice: Asian Women in London. London, 1978.

* Indicates books which contain very useful bibliographies.

FEMINISM AND THE ESTABLISHED CURRICULUM
IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE
Nicholas R. Jones, Oberlin College

Elizabeth Minnich, in her opening address to the Fifth Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference, urged that we must maintain a vision of an academy transformed along feminist lines. We in the field of literature, both students and faculty, have a twofold job: to make sure that the vision is a living one for us; and to confront the realities of transforming the academy to match that vision.

For those of us in literary studies, both jobs are difficult. Literary studies are a paradoxical area for the feminist: the field is both innovative and conservative, and we as its practitioners reflect both sides of the paradox. In many ways the field has been in the forefront of innovative feminist teaching and scholarship. But conservatism within the literary academy is also powerful. The field is inherently traditional: We study the works of the past. The ideas of the past therefore inevitably try to command our minds. More than for other disciplines, I think, the literary academy—its departments, professional activities, curricula, courses, and so forth—is made up of the images of the past, of past academies in particular. We need to teach our discipline in a way that is more responsive to the present and to the future.

I would ask you to conduct a brief thought-experiment. Think of an upper-level course in literature (this may be a course you have taken, or one you have taught, or one you are responsible for as chairperson or dean):

—If it is not a feminist course, think of where its subject-matter comes from (roughly, think of how its title has been derived). Why is it part of the curriculum or of the major? In what ways is it anti-feminist? Does it exclude women writers? Does it fail to relate to the lives of women students?

—If it is a feminist course, ask yourself where it fits into the curriculum and into the major in your department. Is it a core course, or extraneous? Do students, colleagues, chairpersons, or deans perceive it to be of equal value with a course in the standard curriculum?

My guess is that your experiment, if generalized, would yield an image of the non-feminist academy: an institution in which curricular decisions are premised on a tradition of conscious or unconscious exclusion of feminist thinking from the main purposes of education. Our courses, majors, and curricula are overwhelmingly shaped by the past: by images of undergraduate courses and requirements; by processes of graduate school—comprehensive

master's exams, oral exams, seminars; by textbooks, critical "schools" or interpretation, panels of the MLA. In short, our work is strongly influenced by the accretion of years of non-feminist, institutionalized inertia. Even given the rare chance to teach a special topics course or seminar, how easily we think of "Seventeenth Century Prose" or "Herman Melville" rather than "Women in the Enlightenment" or "Slave Narratives"!

The process of transforming the academy is a painful one because the curriculum tends to retain its original shape. Yet there are ways to begin that transformation. We may focus, for example, on courses with unassigned materials (at Oberlin, these are the introductory courses to poetry, fiction, and drama; at other colleges they may include humanities courses, first-year English courses, composition courses). If we use feminist materials and methods in these relatively unencumbered courses, we educate ourselves, our students, and our colleagues concerning the value, and more important, the possibility of a feminist curriculum. We may use special topics courses to focus on feminist issues. We may use lecture funds to bring in and support active feminist writers and critics. We must always work to insert the occasional—or frequent—work into the established curriculum, and to insert the occasional—or frequent—question and comment into the male-dominated course. At the very least, we can always look around and ask, "Where are the women?"

As we move closer to becoming an academy in which feminist scholarship and vision are in the mainstream of the educational current, we will enter on a major re-evaluation of the texts we have been teaching. We have been consistently encouraged to devalue feminist texts in favor of "classics"—the "great books" that have been demonstrated, from a male perspective, to have achieved universality and status as masterworks. We have been trained to value as supreme, unshakeable, the great (and commonly male) authors. The apparent solidity of their canonical position has left room for little else. But as the process of transforming the literary curriculum goes forward, we will more and more pose questions about the worth of each of these "classics," not merely according to the image of women presented, for example, but from a larger perspective. We will ask questions like, "How has it become a 'classic'? Why has it been appreciated? For what purposes has it been used? Whose purposes has it served? What works, ideas, or people has it helped to oppress, or failed to liberate?" We will begin to ask not just, "Why is it good?" but also, "In what ways is it not good?" and "How valid are the standards by which it has been judged a 'classic'?" If a "classic" does not stand up to new evaluation, it will, I think, be bounced from its secure position in the curriculum.

But such evaluation and action constitute difficult and long-range work. As I look to the immediate future of feminist transformation of a curriculum long burdened with the sense of immovable "classics," I see two courses of action:

- Stick with the "classics" and keep asking ourselves (teachers, students, administrators, scholars, writers of textbooks) the tough questions of evaluation. An important part of that process will be understanding the history of their enthronelement as "classics."

- Pair the "classics" with non-classical works, feminist choices; set up a deliberate dialectic by which the literature itself will begin to ask some of the questions we may not yet know how to ask.

These are possibilities for action; it is in entering into actions like these that we directly confront the inertia of the literary curriculum and fix before our minds' eyes the vision of a transformed academy.

EFFECTS OF ISOLATION ON THE WOMAN ARTIST
Joyce Parr, Kenyon College

We need to look at the split between the "art world" and the "real world," and try to heal the dichotomy between them. I gradually came to this conviction through ten years of isolation as a woman artist-wife-mother in rural Ohio. I would like to share some of that experience with you: how I first became separated from the art world, and then how I found a new kind of art that is connected with my life.

Before we moved to rural Ohio eleven years ago, I strongly identified with the "art world." I had put in my time living in New York and I was then teaching in a college, showing my work, consistently winning prizes, and conscientiously keeping in touch with all latest developments. I had a group of friends—other artists like myself—with whom I shared my days and a sense of being somehow superior to the ordinary masses of non-artists. I remember at one faculty show being approached by a small, white-haired lady, who looked as if she spent a lot of time at home crocheting doilies. She asked me what my paintings meant. I made an enigmatic reply and smiled as she walked away in puzzlement. The little old ladies of the world, after all, could never understand "true art."

My move to Kenyon College was the beginning of a decade of transforming experiences. I had married and stopped teaching. Although I managed to keep painting when my first child was born, with two it was not so easy. Moreover, the art I was doing began to feel alien in an odd, undefined way. I felt cut in half: One part of me was the functioning mother-wife-housekeeper; the other was the yearning spirit that wanted to put everything into visual images. I continued making the same kind of art that I had learned to make in graduate school, but I was changing, and the old forms were no longer adequate.

One day, in my searching, I noticed a mention of an exhibition of rural Indian folk art at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. I wrote for the catalog. When it came and I read it, I had one of those great, rare experiences which open doors and fling on lights and cause changes forever in one's vision of things. The name of the exhibit was "Unknown India: Ritual Art in Tribe and Village." The text, which was written by a woman named Stella Kramrish (Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1969), described the art of the middle-class, anonymous, stay-at-home women in East Bengal in the nineteenth century. These women had taken their worn-out clothing and embroidered it together into beautiful images, all having religious and family significance. They hung them on the wall or gave them away to people they loved. Not only did these hangings have the quality of redemption—of making something beautiful out of something which had no apparent value—but in the process of embroidering, something happened inside each woman: She felt an experience of integration; she was embroidering

herself together. I didn't know yet how to bring what I had learned from those nineteenth century Indian women into my art. But while I continued to draw and paint as I had before, I also began to collect scraps and sew them together. This was, at least, a beginning.

We then moved from the village of Gambier into the country. At home with the children, feeling even more isolated, I entered a period of depression. I had known that when you have children, they become a part of your insides: that when they suffer, you feel their suffering as your own. But I did not know that they, in turn, also take your pain into themselves--and this takes a long time to heal. I discovered that the kinds of art I had once considered important now had nothing to do with what was happening to me. As a way to come to terms with one small piece of reality, I began to draw the things around me--egg shells, a jar of marmalade, beets and onions. Then I made large wall hangings of patched pieces, deliberately raggy, with touches of velvet and lace. I entered them in the Ohio State Fair and they were accepted, along with two of my "kitchen" drawings. They looked very cheerful, I thought to myself, and I really began to feel happy about my work--and happier about myself.

Slowly, I began to identify more with the farm wife down the road than with my old artist friends. The farm wife and I were perhaps more alike in our lives than different, both outside hanging up our clothes on the line. I thought of my mother, who raised five children living in an old Finnish immigrant community; my grandmother who raised ten, and ran a farm singlehandedly after her husband died; and aunts, who loved to stay at home and crochet dollies, making their small surroundings as beautiful as they could. All of them hung their clothes on the line. I asked myself, "Why can I not be one of them, and still be an artist?" I began to be less and less inspired by what I saw in museums, and more and more interested in folk art, especially patchwork quilts, hooked rugs, and other works created by women at home.

Gradually my work began to look a little like that folk art. But only after a series of upheavals in our life did my work really become integrated. The house, which we had built ourselves, burned down, and we moved back to Gambier to begin the reconstruction process. Sitting alone in someone else's house, I began making patchwork landscapes in my desire to create a "happy place" to live in. These imaginary folk-art-looking pieces had a feeling which none of my work had had before. I started to insert small houses into the landscape; it gave me great pleasure to stitch around them. I then began to make drawings of the landscapes I was creating in patchwork. For the first time, all my work was coming together, and it no longer looked like anything in the "art world."

This past September I showed this work publicly. At the opening, a little old lady, much like one who stays at home crocheting dollies, or who hangs her clothes up on the line, came up to me and said, "When I look at these things, they make me feel like crying, and I don't know why."

I realize now that I have come a long way. I no longer care about inserting myself into the art world, or about becoming part of art history the way it is usually conceived. Now what I care about most deeply, more deeply than I can express in words, is speaking to that little old lady, and to others like her--

people who may have never taken an art course, read an art magazine, or even set foot in a museum, but who have an inner yearning to see something beautiful in relation to their own lives.

I am now teaching again and my teaching is different, as well. I no longer want to initiate my students into an art world that will separate them from themselves and from other people. I want them to put together the fabric of their own lives into something beautiful. I hope that they will be the transformers of our art world and make life more beautiful for all people; that their work will be integrative and redemptive rather than competitive; and that they will pass their strengths on to others, so that eventually the "art world" and the "real world" will come back together.

HISTORIOGENIC ART: CAMOUFLAGE AND PLUMAGE
Bonnie Woods, Artist

Considering the vast number of people who are alive at any given moment, and considering the infinite number of things that occur at that same given moment, the recording of history is a fascinating business. The historian chooses to perpetuate our memory of certain events, certain people's thoughts and actions. Historical selectivity or bias is, of course, necessary. Bias, in the best sense, is organization and clarity; without it we would have a formless, unusable stockpile of old times. But bias in another sense means irrevocable distortion.

Somewhere in that stockpile lies buried a realm of discarded, "irrelevant" facts wherein women's history exists. In terms of subject matter dealing with women's experience as expressed in the arts, notable art historians are raising prime historiographic questions concerning this information loss. Working artists have only begun to reckon with the subtle academic authority that shapes future events in the name of firm historical antecedents.

We refer to someone whose image or essence is easily "captured" by the photographer as "photogenic." We refer to someone or something that is easily represented in the mass media as "mediagenic." I introduce the term "historiogenic," referring to someone or something that is readily adopted into the history of ideas.

The photogenic person is more than a mere random object of the roving photographer: Most often she or he is one who enjoys being photographed and one who makes herself available to the photographic technologies. Likewise, the mediagenic person is not simply a passive pedestrian, waiting for television cameras and news reporters to document her presence: More often, she is unintimidated by the media and actively elicits media coverage. In a similar way, becoming part of history involves some element of choice: One chooses to entertain the possibility of becoming an active part of visible, documentable history. This rather obvious, intellectual first step is nevertheless a step that women have traditionally been reluctant or unable to take.

Today we are part of the first generation of women artists who are acutely aware of historiographic distortion and how it has rendered us isolated and anonymous for centuries. But now that we have this historical consciousness—and after a decade of anger about it—we are faced with practical questions about being historiogenic, i.e., whether it is desirable at all. Camouflage—an almost invisible existence—has always been an option for women. It has

Parts of this paper are adapted from an address presented at Wittenberg University, May, 1979: "Historiogenic Women: Issues in the Contemporary History of Art."

afforded us certain safeties and, often, deliberate dependencies. The living and working artist, however, designs her own visibility in the world and must necessarily confront the notion of plumage. Her art is her plumage. The complex relationship of her art to the contemporary workings of history is discussed here by addressing historiogenic questions to three specific populations: educators of art within liberal arts academies, feminist consumers of art, and artists who are women.

To the educators of art: Most art students are not landing art-related jobs after graduation. Those who do find jobs and incomes will probably not be the women. This phenomenon has its pros and cons in terms of the graduates' eventual independent development, for it would be senseless to suggest that financial success is the measure of an artist. There are, nevertheless, serious discrepancies between most college art curricula and the highly advanced and competitive technological context that students must necessarily enter. It is to all students' advantage that these discrepancies be openly discussed and analyzed.

Students familiar with mass communications, video, computer graphics, commercial art technologies, and industrial design are clearly the most "marketable." Setting up apprenticeship programs with local businesses and industries might be the most humane way of instructing some of your students, if they are prepared to handle the ethical dilemmas that fine arts graduates face within mass arts.

For the sake of that mere one percent who will eventually support themselves on the basis of their own created structure, the question remains: How does one "teach" historical survival, how does one nurture fortitude, perseverance, cunning, or sheer "guts"? These are contemporary concerns for the artist who is Woman, for her role models have been few, and she is just beginning to find her own form and color.

To the feminist consumers of art: If there is one common denominator among all people who consider themselves "feminist," it is the critique of stereotypes and mythologies about women. We are fully aware of the power of stereotypes in the shaping of our actions, our world view, our place in the social order. Women artists have a sophisticated perspective on that power, for artists, after all, create or perpetuate mythic systems.

Feminists: Support your artists! They are as valuable to you as your highest ranking government legislator, as your most profound theoretician, as your richest benefactor, as your finest grassroots organizer. Artists are your visionaries; do not render them anonymous. Capable of inquiries into the nature of Woman never before imaginable, they are designing your myth and your future.

Historically, women artists have been elusive and camouflaged, often simply because they have not fit into traditional categories based on the mainstream economic base. We cannot continue to contradict the creation of a new economic base by underpaying our artists. Dedicated artists often volunteer designs for our public relations, while unsympathetic printers are paid hundreds of dollars to reproduce the design. Musicians perform gratis at benefits, and often succeed in benefitting themselves out of existence.

Our visual artists, our performers, musicians, writers and poets keep our movements vital, keep our experience visible and accessible. They must be compensated and encouraged in this essential energy.

To the artist who is a woman: Make a conscious choice today about your participation in another history. If it is appropriate see yourself as an explorer, a voyager, a new sort of pirate or Robin Hood. In any case, design your plumage with an eye to the weather, as your work will never end and you will never retire.

If you are concerned about the image of women in mass media, seriously consider entering the field of photography, video, or cinema.

A basic course in computer science is important for any contemporary artist. Computer arts is a fascinating, powerfully seductive medium, presently in its infancy but developing rapidly. Unfortunately, there is little concern for a transformation of traditional images of women and their roles within this new medium because too few enlightened women artists are entering the computer technologies. Consequences of this techno-phobia will be grave, as we have not yet really seen how "mass" an image can become. Beyond the immediate problem of imagery, a formal exploration of the computer medium is an open challenge to anyone concerned with the vision of women.

Women artists' avoidance of business and management-related fields must also be somehow rectified. We must attempt to understand the system in which we exist, not necessarily to emulate it or to emasculate it, but simply in order to manage our own economics, in hopes of moving on.

The study of languages is important: We have only begun to build our international networks.

The arts of visibility, utility, and participation are essential domains of the new artist who is Woman. These include the traditional fields of museum and patron-oriented arts; new guild-like craft networks; social concerns in the environmental arts of architecture, city planning, and industrial design; ethical explorations in mass media; the boundless realms of music, dance, theatre, and other performance arts; the written word, and our body of letters.

Finally, the documentation of our work is crucial as we move into the late twentieth century. Keep records of everything you do: notes, sketchbooks, journals, financial records, copies of letters that include thoughts about your inquiry and descriptions of your work.

Camouflage is necessary to survival: It helps us gather food, sleep, and love. We have long known the ways of camouflage. Successfully, we have gathered food, we have slept, and we have carried the love of civilizations.

Plumage is necessary to survival: It renders us visible, leads us to gather self-knowledge, and helps us attain historical respect. But too often it has been designed for us, not by us. Continue your camouflage wisely, and create your own plumage, your own form and color, as you move into your new dimension in the history of ideas.

DO CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN FILMS SIGNIFICANTLY CRITIQUE PATRIARCHY?

John Schilb, Denison University

Dawn comes to Los Angeles. As the camera slowly approaches the house of producer Jack Woltz, early morning light and quiet grace the landscape. Certainly Woltz deserves his rest, for yesterday was oppressive—an emissary came from the leader of the underworld, demanding that he hire broken-down singer Johnny Fontane for the lead in his new picture. Of course, Woltz refused—but with class, first having the man over for dinner and even letting him admire his magnificent stud horse. So now, as the camera enters his bedroom and lingers over him in sleep, we consider his state of repose a sign that everything will go right with this day.

Yet we cannot help but feel that something has already gone wrong. Has someone else intruded, before we looked in? Woltz, too, stirs with suspicion. He groggily turns to scan the length of his bed. And what he discovers rouses him in horror. For blood has stained his pure white sheets. Flinging them aside, he confronts a more gruesome spectacle at his feet: the head of his prize stallion. With an uncontrollable series of screams, Woltz proclaims his victimization to a world unaware of how the mob will rob a man of his treasure, leaving him nothing in return but a potent symbol of his castration.

The scene is from The Godfather, the 1971 movie that earned millions of dollars while also banking huge amounts of critical esteem. This incident has proven one of its most memorable, since it vividly conveys the ruthlessness of the title character in getting what he wants. But it invites us to indict as well the destructive ambition of all patriarchal power—the various excesses committed by the various brotherhoods and their rulers thriving today, whether in executive boardrooms or senate cloakrooms or college classrooms. This is not to say that every group of male authorities would decapitate a horse in their own race for glory. The act caricatures, however, the historical reality of masculine force, the legacy of acquisition and annihilation bestowed by centuries of male command.

Several other American films of the seventies also spur us to question such domination. And while the decade is noted for its dearth of good parts for actresses, the conduct of the male collectives which loomed much more often on local screens provided rich material for the student of patriarchal consciousness.

Does Hollywood therefore merit our approval for a sociological job well done? Unfortunately, no. The critical visions of patriarchy it has presented in the last ten years were created by those men who are very much within patriarchy itself—for Hollywood is the equivalent of patriarchy. Recall that classic scene from The Godfather once more, and note the self-pity revealed by it.

The victim of male brutality here is not a woman (or a member of any group oppressed by patriarchy) but Jack Woltz, filmmaker. Traumatized as we are by the event, it certifies at the same time that we cannot trust its creators to have a disinterested perspective on masculine abuses—not when they choose to see themselves as the persecuted instead of the perpetrators. If contemporary American films such as this one do make charges against patriarchy, they also show an ambivalence toward it which feminist educators must continually work to expose. In constructing a model of a feminist academy, we overlook at our peril how the ideological content of films can affect the thousands of people who attend them. By keeping audiences alert to what movies are really saying or neglecting to say about our society, we stand a chance of fostering a genuinely critical and genuinely productive awareness of its male supremacist codes.

Because limitations of space prevent an exhaustive survey of recent American cinema, I will focus on a case which exemplifies the limitations of patriarchs examining patriarchs. The two Godfather movies of Francis Ford Coppola, taken together, reveal a director entrapped in the cultural perspective he set out to discredit. Surely he is not a covert Mafioso. But just as surely he is not an untainted critic of the masculine heritage his criminals represent.

The first film basically concerns the behavior of men as fathers, brothers, sons, and husbands. The film begins in a dark interior where two men are conversing about their daughters. One is Bonasera, who calls for revenge against the rapists of his daughter. The other is Don Vito Corleone, the Godfather, who yearns to join his own daughter's wedding reception outside. With this introduction, Coppola seeks to make us immediately aware of the benevolent despotism fatherhood can involve—the benevolence indicated by both men's regard for their female offspring, the despotism evoked by the plan for vengeance they concoct. Although the daylight world where Don Corleone eventually waltzes with Connie superficially contrasts with his inner sanctum of drawn blinds and murderous conspiracies, his and Bonasera's paternal tenderness is closely related to their proud militancy. Their care and their fury denote the same main impulse: to hold and exercise power, whether for good or for ill, whether in the confines of the biological clan or in the wider realm of the crime "family." Friedrich Engels and subsequent social critics have observed how the family unit replicates the power relations of the capitalist marketplace beyond it, with the father assuming the status of owner and controller that he seeks to establish in the economy as a whole. By depicting how Don Corleone exploits resources and labor to play the savior of Bonasera, the smiter of his enemies, and then showing Don Corleone whirling his daughter around the floor, Coppola encourages us to connect fatherly solicitude with more sinister goals.

As the plot of the film and the plots of its characters unfold, Coppola makes us increasingly aware of how this particular father has inculcated his children with much more hatred than love, and how that inheritance ultimately warps them. He leads us to see that Don Corleone's devotion becomes a perversion of love when it fills his sons with values that are self-destructive or destructive of others. Neither Sonny, the Godfather's original heir apparent, nor Michael, his eventual successor, can balance compassion and malevolence as smoothly as he can; metaphorically speaking, their lives are shrouded in darkness with few glimmers of light. And their fate naturally casts a shadow over the professed equilibrium of the Godfather himself.

Sonny Corleone is perhaps the most blatant example in the film of the "loving" yet fundamentally aggressive male. He suffers a manic compulsion to be the perfect protective brother. Anxious to avenge his sister when her new husband assaults her, he leaves Carlo in a bloody heap on the sidewalk as he struts away relishing the vitality of his familial sentiments and of his fists. However, the next time he rushes to her assistance, he is ambushed by rival hoodlums who use machine guns instead of knuckles. While Sonny's demise in one sense results from the villainous machinations of outside forces, in another sense it is the consequence of his longing for control over other people—women like Connie, men like Carlo.

With Sonny's death, Michael becomes the next in line for the throne. He survives because he does not hot-bloodedly indulge in acts of hostility, but instead coolly channels his animosity into prudent, long-range strategies for conquest. Of course, his arranged massacre of his foes near the end, occurring as he is presiding over the baptism of his nephew, makes the division between his calm facade and inner malice glaringly obvious to the viewer. Michael had at first wished to stay a respectable war hero. He pledges himself to his family's battles, though, after his father is shot and Michael himself is wounded for not being a dutiful enough son. His return to the circle certainly reflects an exaggerated sense of filial piety: He should be able to love his father without having to take over his numbers rackets. Yet in his willingness to compromise his development as an ethical individual, to accept with complacency his father's way of life, Michael is not so remote from those of us—perhaps most of us—who blindly emulate the patriarchs of our family and of our society. By the finish, Michael has officially adopted the title of Don Corleone, having consolidated his authority through the execution of his challengers. These included Carlo, much to Connie's dismay. When Michael's wife Kay asks him point-blank if he did indeed order his brother-in-law killed, Michael chooses to lie—thereby insuring domestic peace for himself during his respites from urban combat, just as many husbands resolve to keep their wives in blissful, bliss-giving ignorance. At the beginning of the film, the Godfather moves from his office out into the world; but now we see Michael closeting himself and shutting out Kay—a dramatic indication that Michael will exhibit more misanthropy than his father ever did.

Given these substantial insights into patriarchy that The Godfather yields, what is wrong with this picture? The New York audience I saw it with told me by their reaction. They greeted every murder with howls of acclaim. Any time a character said, "I'll make him an offer he can't refuse," they applauded. At the conclusion, when the door to Michael's chamber of horrors is literally shut in Kay's face, they laughed. I do not believe such responses simply typify the weirdness of Manhattan movegoers; I do think they highlight Coppola's inability to render his criminals truly unattractive. He stages much of his action in the exhilarating fashion of thirties Warner Brothers thrillers—overcoming their crudity, yet stimulating the same high spirits we feel when Edward G. Robinson snarls at the coppers or Jimmy Cagney smashes a grapefruit in Mae Clark's face. There is, admittedly, that other compartment in our minds which rejects this behavior as morally nauseating. But film can be a highly seductive medium, sweeping us up against our will into the kinetic excitement that even competent maneuvering of performers, framing of scenes, and editing of rhythms can generate. A truly determined director might be

able to reduce the intoxication we experience during the more intense motions of motion pictures—focusing on the ethical implications of violence, for example, by resorting to long close-ups of its victims. Such a director would have to forsake, however, the "entertainment" that moviegoers normally expect films to provide. And Coppola, in this phase of his career, was not that kind of director. He had yet to produce a box-office hit in an industry which prizes economic reward above everything else. He had been entrusted with a multi-million dollar production; if it failed commercially, he would probably never be given an opportunity like this again. In short, he was bidding for power in the Hollywood patriarchy—and so he was willing to play by its rules. When the game was over, he was, in fact, at the top of the male hierarchy that controls American cinema and, obviously, the imaginations of those who pretend to question it while remaining within its framework.*

Besides refusing to neutralize the entertainment impact of *The Godfather's* explosive episodes, Coppola tends to romanticize Marlon Brando in his portrayal of the title character. At times the camera elegiacally captures a despair in the aging mobster, sympathetically noting the wrinkles in his face, the futile gestures of his hands as he voices his grief over the fate of his sons and friends. The cinematography at these moments never approaches harshness. I am not saying that the characters should simply be denounced; but Brando's Don Corleone could endure a less kindly depiction. Perhaps a director less entranced by the mystique of his star could have given us a more penetrating study of the part that the star assumed.

Finally, the women in the film come across as too asinine to merit even pity. Mama Corleone, played by the gifted jazz singer Morgana King, clucks occasionally in confusion. Connie seems nothing more than a masochistic hysteric, even though playing her is Talia Shire, Coppola's real-life sister. Michael's first wife, Apollonia, whom he marries while hiding out in Sicily, seems to embody that eternal male ideal of voluptuousness combined with childish docility; and the movie implicitly asks us to mourn when she dies. Kay retains a moral fibre which conflicts with her husband's practices, yet she is not granted enough intelligence to stand as anything more than a dupe. *The Godfather* even does what no other American film of the seventies could—it makes Diana Keaton dull. I am not contending that every movie must depict women as Einsteins. But Coppola and screenwriter Mario Puzo could have dramatized the powerlessness of these women without stripping them of their human complexity. This stereotypical representation of women reveals the artists' inability to surmount in their own minds the destructive iconography upon which patriarchy has thrived.

* Coppola was controlled by the hierarchy in a more concrete sense—Paramount executives had the right to the final cut of the film. They exercised that right by putting in a conclusion that he did not want. However, his having to submit himself to their will shows how much he was locked into their corporate society. And at any rate, his own proposed ending—Kay's lighting candles to commemorate the idea of a family—appears sentimental and in fact patriarchal, a contradiction of what has resulted from family loyalty throughout the movie. See Michael Pye and Lynda Myles, *The Movie Brats: How the Film Generation Took Over Hollywood* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), p. 93.

The 1974 sequel Godfather II remedies the weaknesses of its predecessor somewhat. Coppola was no doubt enticed into making it by the prospect of earning additional money and renown. He was also motivated, though, by his sensitivity to those comparatively few critics who felt he had glamorized the Corleones. He wanted to prove they had misjudged him.* And in the second film, with less stress on giddy shoot-em-ups and more careful charting of Michael's moral decay, he does better communicate a sense of the family's evil. When, for instance, Michael has his own brother Fredo murdered, we are made forcefully cognizant of the extent to which his lust for power and his insecurity have dissolved, not strengthened, human connections. Moreover, Kay actually rebels, even aborting Michael's son to thwart his dynasty.

Yet Kay becomes curiously passive when Michael seizes custody of their children. In a scene reminiscent of the earlier film, he slams a kitchen door in her face after she visits them—demonstrating that he has freely usurped women's traditional domains of motherhood and household maintenance, because he feels she might poison even those narrow preserves. Apparently Coppola still believes here that women are ultimately lobotomized by male injustice, basically deficient in the fortitude needed for a lasting campaign against it.

Another problem: Vito Corleone, seen through extensive flashbacks in a portrait of the Mafioso as a young man, exudes a great deal of charm. Coppola juxtaposes Corleone's early Robin Hood crusades against the tyrants of Sicily and Little Italy with Michael's conquest of Lake Tahoe and politicians during the fifties. Through this contrast, Coppola shows once more that the father's struggle for control over his environment, even if founded in righteous indignation, eventually leads to the son's outright sin. But again, this aim could have been accomplished without all the images of young Vito as an attractive blade. Coppola might have lost some irony in giving Vito the touches of seediness that come to blemish Michael, and his re-creation of turn-of-the-century New York might have lost some of its romantic atmosphere; but the dark truth of Vito's personality would have been more striking. That Coppola softens a potentially rigorous characterization a second time betokens a perspective that doubtless is influenced by his own ascent through the corporate structure of his field.

I could have discussed other major films that are corroded by a similar ambivalence. Chinatown, with its attack on a grandfatherly exploiter of the land and its reduction of its heroine to an abstract symbol of existential despair. The Deer Hunter, with its tracing of and lament over the decline of the Hemingway hero. Deliverance, with its mockery and approval of male forays into the woods. Animal House, which laughs at and exults in fraternity shenanigans. Star Wars, which values an intrepid princess but esteems a mystical brotherhood of knights even more. Rocky, with its hero triumphing over the elitist boxing world and its heroine gaining a sense of her own worth only through attachment to him. Here, however, two questions ought to be answered: Are there any contemporary American films at all which significantly critique patriarchy? And what can be done to assure more?

* Pye and Myles, p. 103.

The China Syndrome (1979) does succeed in illustrating how men can threaten women and one another. The original title of the movie was Power, an indication that it was not meant to be solely about the hazards of nuclear energy. Certainly the finished work calls attention to those dangers; but in addition to atomic power, it also concerns the power of the broadcast media and, most important, the patriarchal power behind the two industries. Furthermore, it shows two people becoming conscious of how a self-serving male bureaucracy can hide the truth; and it allows them to act upon their new knowledge with significant results. Engineer Jack Lemmon realizes that the nuclear plant at which he works is dangerous, contrary to the official reports of his superiors. News reporter Jane Fonda resists her employers' relegation of her to light features and tries with Lemmon to publicize the threat of nuclear catastrophe. When Lemmon is killed in their demonstration at the plant, Fonda communicates on television her rage at the cartel that wanted them stopped. The audience in the theatre is clearly offered, therefore, an account of how patriarchy can harm the human race, along with a hope that people can subvert it.

Yet while citing the virtues of the movie, we must note that its feminist message surely derives in large part from the influence that Jane Fonda can at last wield in Hollywood. This notion leads to the conclusion that more women must occupy positions of power in the film world to make more such pictures likely. Promotions of females cannot guarantee the advent of profound social commentaries; the acclaimed choice of Sherry Lansing as production head of Twentieth-Century Fox a few months ago may or may not prove important. But if women are provided opportunities to exert control over the filmmaking process, the chances for worthwhile analyses of patriarchy are definitely increased.

Whether the chances will ever be increased enough is a matter for continuing debate. It may be that a truly feminist cinema will never be born within the Hollywood system. Perhaps the system must be shattered or completely bypassed by feminists before they can ensure that their visions of life will appear on celluloid. Should we adopt reformist strategies or move into radical action? Our academy of the future will have to decide—and not just in film classrooms.

RECRUITING AND RETAINING WOMEN FACULTY

Jon Fuller, President, Great Lakes Colleges Association

Colleges need and want more women as faculty members and administrators. Our sense of equity demands it. So, increasingly, do our students. Most colleges have learned, however, that recruiting women is not easy, even in today's "buyers' market." Retaining women faculty members is often even more difficult.

During the 1979 GLCA Women's Studies Conference, a panel of administrators examined these issues.* This article summarizes many of the administrative practices which they identified as important in both the recruitment and the retention of women.

Recruitment

Colleges which are serious about wanting and needing more women as faculty and administrators cannot allow the search and selection process to proceed on a laissez faire basis. It is not a matter which can be left to the intuition, good will, and skill of individual departments and administrative units. These are matters of concern to the entire college, and must be formally treated as such.

If affirmative action is a serious college policy, then the affirmative action officer must have the formal authority to affect the recruitment process. Formal recruitment guidelines are worth the trouble--despite a natural academic resistance to bureaucratic procedures and standardization. A simple and effective technique is to require the approval of the affirmative action officer before bills for advertising and interviews are paid. That will ensure that affirmative action is taken seriously in each search.

There must be formal guidance, so that both the public advertising, and the additional calls and letters which begin the recruitment process, clearly communicate the institution's commitment to seek and give fair consideration to women candidates. Notices in special women's publications may not reach many additional potential candidates, but they do affirm the seriousness of the institution in seeking women candidates.

Stating the qualifications for any position in terms of the competencies which will be required or the major issues which must be addressed, rather than in terms of previous positions held, helps more fairly to evaluate women candidates. Women still do not have equality of opportunity in the academic

* The panelists were Louis Brakeman, Provost at Denison; Diane Crothers, Assistant Director of Women's Studies at Vassar; and Marilyn LaPlante, Associate Provost at Kalamazoo.

world, and they certainly did not have such equal opportunity a few years ago. If we are to redress the imbalance in less than several generations, we must recognize that the academic habit of assessing qualifications for a job in terms of previous jobs must be altered. (We might recall that the "Peter Principle" was first identified in the academic world.) A focus on competencies is more obviously appropriate in recruiting administrators. In recruiting faculty, the equivalent focus means taking seriously candidates who have interrupted the "normal" (i.e., "male") career patterns because of family responsibilities.

Pressing search committees to think out their needs in terms of competencies rather than prior experience will make it more likely that they will consider women candidates seriously. Identifying such concerns about competencies in the public notices about a vacancy is also useful in further identifying that search as one which intends to give serious and fair consideration to female candidates. It is also likely to produce better final selections.

When references of final candidates are being checked, it is useful to be quite specific about the problems and expectations for that particular position, asking referees to describe a candidate in precise and directly relevant terms.

When candidates come to campus, it is important to remember that recruitment is a mutual process. It is certainly in the college's interest to see that interviews present an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their particular strengths. It is equally important that the college show itself to be a community to which women would want to belong.

On most campuses, where women are still a minority of the faculty and administrative staff, it is useful to schedule opportunities for candidates to meet other women on the campus, beyond the department or administrative unit where they are being considered. It is also helpful to include more than one woman (and more than one minority person) among the candidates who are actually brought for final interviews. This makes it easier to judge each candidate as an individual, not forcing the lone woman or minority person to be a group symbol.

As the final selection decisions are made, the institution should have procedures which assure that the reasons for the selection are clearly and fairly identified. Such procedures should also ensure that the broader interests of the entire college are fully considered, along with the needs and interests of the particular department or administrative unit.

There is a common tendency, which needs to be identified and resisted, to require that women demonstrate their qualifications for a job through actual performance of that kind of job, while looking only at the potential of the men.

As a general aid to specific recruitment searches, it is also important to recognize that many future candidates come first to our institutions, getting to know us and becoming known, through visits for lectures or consultations. That means that a fully effective affirmative action recruitment program includes seeing that women and minorities are well represented among those who are brought to campus for these other purposes.

Part-Time and Shared Positions

Another way to increase the number of women on our faculties is to take more seriously the possibilities of appointments which are less than full-time. At most institutions, part-time positions have traditionally been temporary and marginal. A growing number of institutions, however, including several among the GLCA, have seen the value of recognizing a part-time appointment as a regular and full-status position.

The first key to making part-time positions work is to be very clear about what is expected. While such positions are generally defined in terms of the amount of classroom teaching to be done, it is important to be explicit about responsibilities for advising students, supervising independent study projects, participating in departmental decisions, and serving on college committees. Such matters can be negotiated individually, but they need to be made clear for each case.

The fringe benefits which make up the rest of the compensation package can generally be provided in proportion to the part of a full teaching load which is being negotiated. Other matters, such as voting rights in faculty meetings, participation in departmental and college decision-making, and eligibility for professional development support also need to be specified.

Even part-time tenure is possible. A few years ago, most college administrators would have regarded that as unthinkable. But at least three GLCA colleges (Oberlin, Kenyon, and Earlham) have now developed detailed provisions for considering tenure for part-time faculty members.

Joint or shared appointments represent another approach which can also bring more women to a college's faculty. Such appointments have usually been negotiated with married couples, although two GLCA colleges (Oberlin and Denison) have now developed such positions shared by two unrelated individuals (in both cases, the two faculty members sharing the appointment are women).

Joint or shared appointments also require more than usual specificity about what is expected of each individual, about how employment decisions, including tenure, are to be made, and about benefits and rights. Models now exist for such appointments, and the experience of a number of institutions testifies to the value and the workability of these arrangements.

Both part-time and shared appointments are likely to be more attractive to women, particularly to those who are balancing family and professional responsibilities. Because such women can make a very special contribution to a college, particularly as examples for students of possible career patterns, it is well worth the trouble to work out the necessary administrative arrangements to make it possible for them to join our faculties.

The advantages for an institution include the unique contributions which each individual involved can make, as well as the almost universal observation that individuals involved in part-time or shared appointments give considerably more than the agreed upon percentage of time to their jobs. (Indeed, administrators need to be aware of this to avoid exploiting the individuals involved in such arrangements.) There are administrative problems in such faculty arrangements, to be sure, but those can be solved and the benefits they provide to the institution make them well worth solving.

Retention

A first question for any institution hoping to retain female faculty members is whether or not its formal terms of employment are indeed equitable. The recent changes in retirement policies by TIAA remove one of the problems in this regard. Equity in salaries is always a difficult issue in the academic world, but there are now tests which have been developed (by the AAUP, for example) which will help an institution identify systematic patterns of discrimination in compensation. Maternity leaves are another special concern for retaining women faculty members or administrators. The college's policies about temporary illness or disability will usually be a guide to an equitable policy.

Of concern to many women, particularly those with a feminist commitment in their teaching, is the range of subjects they will be allowed to teach, and what kinds of professional activity will be recognized and rewarded by the institution. The opportunity to teach courses focused on women's issues or specifically in women's studies will be an additional attraction for some women to come and remain as part of our faculties. Recognition and support for research and course development on women's issues will also make a campus a more attractive place for a woman to come and stay.

Most colleges need to think much more carefully and explicitly about helping faculty members, both full and part-time, who are combining professional and significant family responsibilities. This is more often a special problem for women, although an increasing number of men are also finding themselves facing these problems. The two-career couple is now the norm in most college communities.

One issue is the availability of child care in the community. The specific role of the college will vary in terms of the situation in that community. If a college is serious about having women on its faculty and administrative staff, it has a self-interest in being sure that appropriate child care arrangements are available. If they are not, the institution can use its influence, and perhaps provide some material support, to make such arrangements available.

Another matter is the scheduling of faculty responsibilities, specifically of committee and faculty meetings. If these are routinely scheduled for early in the morning, late in the afternoon, or early in the evening, they will create particular problems for anyone with responsibilities for younger children. In the past, those scheduling such meetings have not even thought of that consideration, and those who were inconvenienced by the scheduling have been often made to feel that they had no right to object. Principal administrators and faculty leaders who want to see more women come and stay in the faculties of our colleges need to be more sensitive to such matters.

It may be necessary to be more flexible about the scheduling of other faculty duties, particularly for people with responsibility for younger children. Rather than losing their services altogether, the institutions may want to arrange temporarily an appointment which is less than full-time.

Institutions also need to protect women and minority faculty members from an unfair and exhausting additional burden of counseling and advising students--a burden which is placed upon them precisely because we have not yet been able

to recruit and retain as many women and minority faculty members as we need. That very burden can become one of the reasons why these particularly valued faculty members do not stay. For them, exhaustion is a serious problem, and principal administrators need to help them guard against it. This may require additional support staff in the student counseling area, or special training for white male faculty members which might enable them to take on some of the demands which otherwise flow naturally to the women and minority members of the faculty. Those who do extra work, in individual counseling or in working with student groups, need to have recognition and public credit for their work.

The Atmosphere of the Campus

It is sometimes not the formal and easily identified problems which cause women to leave our colleges, but rather informal or even seemingly trivial matters which eventually take their toll. This includes such things as the proper and consistent use of titles for both men and women in the addressing of mail, the publication of lists, and in meetings. If the men are consistently referred to as "professor" or "doctor", the same pattern needs to apply to the women. That seems obvious once it is said, but we all know that habits may lead us to treat women less formally than our male colleagues.

Presidents, chief academic officers, and senior faculty members need to take a lead in such things as listening carefully when women speak in meetings. There is an all-too-common habit, particularly among men, of not really listening seriously when women speak. They often betray their inattention by making the same point later in the discussion, without any reference to the woman who made it previously, or by responding to a woman's comments in a way that show they really didn't hear. Certainly, such problems of communication can happen between males, but they are still more likely when it is women who have been speaking.

Principal administrators and faculty leaders also need to provide both private and public approval and encouragement to the women who are taking a leading role in women's issues on a campus, both in the curriculum and in student life. In fact, on many campuses, a scholarly or teaching interest in women's studies is seen as evidence of a lack of disciplinary commitment. If colleges really intend to retain talented women faculty, they should not limit approval to those whose specialization fits clearly within the traditional boundaries of a single academic department.

It is important to recognize that support networks can be very helpful to women faculty and administrators. Too often such networks have been seen as some kind of threat to men, or as a political bloc. We must recognize, however, that being a female or a minority faculty member or administrator on most campuses is still lonely and uncertain, and special support is often needed.

In the matter of the informal atmosphere of the campus, as in so many of the more formal practices in recruitment and employment, the most serious problem has been simple inattention. The senior administrators (most often males), who need to take a lead in this, simply haven't thought carefully enough or

talked extensively enough about it to recognize the often obvious solutions. None of these solutions is, by itself, a "magic formula." But all of these matters, taken together, can provide the way toward success in recruiting and retaining more women on the faculties of our colleges.

Closing Panel

CURRICULUM REFORM, OR WHAT DO YOU MEAN,
"OUR COLLEGE SHOULD HAVE A FEMINIST CURRICULUM"?

Panelists: Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich, Moderator; and Louis F. Brakeman, Provost, Denison University; Paula L. Goldsmid, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Oberlin College; and Alison Bernstein, Program Officer, The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

ELIZABETH MINNICH: Focusing on curriculum—which is very much at the heart of what we do—we are going to talk about specific examples of what has been done in some places, saying quite pointedly how things were accomplished, in terms of techniques, and how they were thought about and spoken about—and how people were helped to understand, accept, and go along with these ideas. We will use concrete examples as a source of inspiration. The panelists will go first; then we would like to make this meeting, despite its size, into something of a workshop. If you have a specific change in the curriculum in mind, or a specific block that you have run into, these are very good people to talk to about how you might go at it differently—to find new techniques, new strategies. Also, if you have an example of a technique, a way of phrasing something, a rationale you have found successful, we would like this to be a time to share it. We will have some open discussion, staying as concrete as possible, and then there will be a few closing words. Lou, would you like to start?

LOUIS BRAKEMAN: Thank you. As a prelude I would like to reflect just briefly on some reactions I had to Elizabeth's opening remarks this weekend. In her exciting articulation of a transformed academy, she characterized the feminist perspective as emphasizing both criticism of a radical sort and friendship. I see her proposals as set against an unquestioning acceptance of basic assumptions, basic values, practices (the unexamined life) and, too, as set against the isolation (perhaps indeed the loneliness) of individuals in their own teaching, their own disciplines, their own research worlds.

Elizabeth called for a curriculum emphasizing certain basic themes. Was she suggesting perhaps a course on what it means to be human: to be male, to be female; perhaps a course on friendship; perhaps a course on the nature of criticism from various disciplinary points of view?

These reflections led me to affirm what I had thought about sharing on this occasion. I wondered why it was that I had been receptive to women's studies at Denison. Why was I not alarmed? Why did I see what was proposed as perfectly legitimate? Well, obviously, to find out why in any basic sense would take a lot of unpacking, and I don't propose to get into that. But at one level, at least, the answer was easy.

When I became Dean of the College back in 1970, I shared some thoughts with faculty in an informal session on the liberal arts. At that time I hadn't heard of women's studies. I stated three criticisms of the liberal arts as taught at that time, and, in response, three propositions. First, I observed that some faculty mistakenly assume that liberal education need not include any reference to values other than those that constitute the dominant Western civilization we all know. I suggested, in response, that liberal education must include an examination of—and indeed a confrontation with—values other than those in which the person has been nurtured.

Second, I criticized a model of liberal arts education which saw as its chief goal the preparation of persons for professional careers. My proposition in response called for the encouragement of more imaginative goals. It called for the breaking out of disciplinary boundaries, and out of a largely exclusive emphasis on preparation for graduate and professional work.

Third, I raised objections to the virtually exclusive emphasis on rational discourse; to ignoring emotional responses, and to the separation of intellectual learning from experiential learning. The responding proposition argued for the inclusion of the emotional: for experiential models that address affective as well as cognitive learning.

Why bother with this recollection? There is, I think, a practical point to it all. The call for a feminist academy seems to me to be calling us to at least some of the same sorts of transformations that many in the academy have had on their minds and hearts for several years; and it is doing it in a more essential, more pointed, more immediate and, I think, more compelling fashion. The critique now being made may well have the potential of bringing about, finally, some real educational reform. Many may well be ready for a new concept of the liberal arts. It seems to me there certainly is a pressing need for such a transformation; for a liberal arts education which is liberating and humanizing, one that enhances competence, one that inspires confidence, one that challenges, one that celebrates. Isn't that, after all, what liberal arts really ought to be all about?

So, in working at our own colleges, perhaps we might listen to the voices that we hear around us. There may be allies out there that we have not yet identified.

Now let me turn to a second level response and share two sets of activities from our experience at Denison.

In the fall of 1977, a group of faculty, particularly those teaching Black Studies and Women's Studies, began conversations. Early in the second semester, those discussions were moved into the formal governing bodies of the college, and by spring the college had adopted a general education requirement for Minority Studies/Women's Studies. The requirement calls for each student to have completed before graduation a course in which the nature and effects of discrimination against women and/or minorities are examined. A set of criteria was adopted for deciding which courses counted for the requirement. I would like to read just a portion of that set of criteria:

A major focus of any course which fulfills this requirement must be the nature and effects of discrimination against women and/or minorities. The case of discrimination against Hispanics provides a paradigmatic example of the issues with which a course should deal. Discrimination against Hispanics has restricted their opportunities and economic choices. It has reduced their talents, skills and abilities, and it has inculcated attitudes in both non-Hispanics and Hispanics which tend to reduce and degrade the value of the achievements and accomplishments of Hispanics. Most of this has been accomplished by the establishment of economic, legal, and political barriers. These formal structures have institutionalized widespread societal values. To satisfy this requirement, a course must deal with groups subject to comparable forms of discrimination. Blacks, women, Native Americans, and Asian-Americans are obvious examples of such groups in the contemporary United States. Courses dealing with other appropriate groups will be considered. Any course which fulfills this requirement should serve to enhance student understanding of the effects of discrimination against women and minorities in the contemporary United States.

The temptation is to go, in some detail, into some of the conditions surrounding the consideration of this requirement. I'll resist that and rather make several observations that might be helpful in your own situations. The proposal's success is in part attributable to the following factors:

1. We did have at Denison a pattern of general education requirements; general education or distribution requirements had not died at Denison in the late sixties.
2. We had a consensus, a fairly powerful one, that there was a need for the predominantly white student body to have their consciousness raised. This was a powerful stimulus to the acceptance of the requirement.
3. There was close cooperation between blacks and women, and others, as well.
4. The final legislation was not identical to the original proposal, and was the result of the willingness of all sides to make concessions.
5. There was continuous attention to strategy and tactics as the process went on: Arguments were anticipated, responses were worked out ahead of time.
6. There was a willingness to take time and not to push for resolutions when the estimate was that such insistence might result in defeat.
7. There was clear administrative, including presidential, support.
8. Finally, there was student support at critical times in the process. For example, a statement was submitted that was signed by virtually every student group on campus, including several groups that most people would not have expected to have welcomed such a requirement.

The second set of activities at Denison centers on our current grant from the Andrew Mellon Foundation to enhance career opportunities for women. The program includes visiting professionals, a workshop for faculty advisors, the development of videotapes to assist in the advising function for women, the identification and training of faculty career advisors, summer stipend money for faculty, and a program aimed at enhancing mathematical competence.

A few insights about the goals of this grant might be ones you could use at your own colleges. In the first place, we have been encouraged to ask a series of what might be called institutional research questions: In what disciplines have students majored? Is there a difference between women and men? What careers have women undertaken after graduation? Have the patterns been different from those of men? What are the attitudes of Denison graduates toward their education? Are there discernible differences in attitude between men and women? What are the mathematical skills that students bring with them to college, and how are those skills related to the majors they choose? The raising of these questions and the answers we are finding are causing us to ask questions about the adequacy of our curriculum.

In the second place, we identified specific intervention strategies. For example, we tried to build on issues or questions which the faculty already consider legitimate and which also have the potential of connecting to other issues that are not yet considered legitimate. For example, by building on a concern about the general mathematical ability of students, one can then move on to questions about the relationship between gender and mathematical competence. Or one can start by asking if more men than women regularly major in a particular discipline, and go on to ask why this might be so, attempting to identify causes, attitudes, or lack of competencies that may act as deterrents.

One final observation: If we are to make progress on curricular changes of any significance, we must pay attention to the total environment of a college. Paula will comment more on this. In closing, I want simply to emphasize that we must consider carefully the specific activities, structures, and policies of our institutions at a variety of levels, and work for changes at each of these levels so that the total environment becomes one in which curricular change is more likely to occur.

PAULA GOLDSMID: My moral or message is two-fold. First, try to view the requirements of the situation as providing opportunity. By that I don't mean the happy, smiling face, "have a good day," get up in the morning and feel positive and things will work out. Individual attitudes cannot change the world. What I recommend is a careful examination of what your situation requires, promotes, draws attention to, and of the opportunities it affords you. This is a very good use of time and energy. Later I'll give some concrete examples. Second, behave as if you are "normal," as if you are more established and respectable than you are, as if the people around you are your allies, as if you have never doubted that you belong, as if the invitation to the party includes you and you just haven't noticed that you might be different from the others who have been invited. And I'll say a bit more about that later, too.

In thinking about being up here with Lou, I naturally started thinking about differences between Oberlin and Denison. I would like to list a few of those.

They include some things that, at least superficially, seem very discouraging for the transformation of the curriculum, and of the academy in general. But there is a "flip side" to some of those disadvantages that can be construed as opportunity, and I'll begin by giving some examples of how we have used the opportunities afforded by some of those very restrictions. I would also like to talk about one project in which I am now engaged. The opportunity to be on this panel has led me to view that project within the framework of transforming the academy. I am grateful to the program committee for that, because I didn't see it in that way before.

At Oberlin, we would never be able to work on requirements for women's studies or minority studies, because we don't have any general education requirements. Nor do we have any mechanism for guaranteeing that any course will be a permanent one. We have no central body that approves courses. We are a very decentralized place in which decisions about curriculum are made essentially by departments.

Lou also mentioned another notion which I find very exciting: the inclusion of approaches that go beyond the tradition of rational, intellectual disciplinary discourse in our idea of education and the curriculum, i.e., the inclusion of experiential education and the recognition of the validity of emotional responses to our world. To say that this is rather foreign to Oberlin is an understatement. I am currently chairing a program committee for the college's only interdisciplinary program which explicitly—in the catalog—places a high value on experiential education. That program has one-half of a faculty position which runs out at the end of this year and is not likely to be renewed.

Complacency is another characteristic of Oberlin. We were the first coeducational college in the country, so naturally, we must be meeting the curricular needs of women students. They have been here all the time, right? We haven't had to make any particular adjustments in our curriculum for women; we pride ourselves on how well our women students do in the "regular" (read "male") curriculum. We also have one of the highest proportions of minority students of any predominantly white college in the country, so even though we recognize that they have some special needs, we can be fairly complacent still. We assume, at Oberlin, that the educational needs of both women and men—as well as minority students—are fully met by the traditional liberal arts curriculum. At least that curriculum seems to be what we believe to be ideal for all students, because nobody has ever questioned it.

We are very curriculum-oriented, very content-oriented. We do not talk much about teaching, about the organization of the classroom, about interactions among people in the process of teaching and learning. The faculty development issues inherent in women's studies are thus difficult to talk about at Oberlin. Our focus is also very disciplinary. Little of an interdisciplinary nature goes on, though there has been more of that in the last few years. To refer to Elizabeth's terms from the other day—and I don't think this is unique to Oberlin—we are rather good at critique, at least in the intellectual, rational realm, but we are not very good at the kind of friendship she described, the caring confrontation and the willingness really to fight things out. Because decisions are fairly decentralized, it is easy for us to avoid that confrontation, or to contain it. We do not engage in it as a faculty very often.

You might wonder then how we managed to generate a Women's Studies Program that has a catalog supplement listing more than twenty courses, that offers an Individual Major in Women's Studies, that has been able to involve several committees in really working to transform the academy in various ways. It is because our campus has certain characteristics that we can use to our advantage. Let me tell you about some of these.

Some of our strengths derive from our traditions. One important tradition is our consciousness of being the first coeducational college. Paradoxically, we may derive strength from the very complacency about that fact which permeates the campus. It is so taken for granted that being the first coeducational college means that there has been attention to the educational needs of women, that when it is pointed out that we have not lived up to the promise of our tradition in this area, there is no escape from the conclusion that something must be done about this. Also embedded in our tradition are many statements of liberal values and liberal educational philosophy, which can be called on in similar fashion.

Another important tradition at Oberlin is an orientation to procedure. Those who can translate ideas into institutionalized procedures are ahead at Oberlin.

Moving away from our glorious past, some other characteristics of the way we are organized as a college also contribute to our ability to strengthen women's studies. These include the fact that decision-making is very decentralized, and that there is a great deal of tolerance of what goes on in other people's departments or areas. For example, while most people at Oberlin do not favor experiential approaches to education, if a person in his or her department uses such approaches, no one obstructs them. Everybody is too busy minding their own business.

Another advantage is that there is a fair amount of credence in student opinions, if the students have established their legitimacy. For example, students participate on committees in the various departments, and faculty are embarrassed to vote against something that students are very clearly supporting. There is a great reluctance to say or do anything publicly that goes against the liberal and "progressive" Oberlin stance. Oberlin's liberal values can be turned to our advantage.

The decentralization of decision-making, and the tolerance that goes along with it, are something that I want to comment on at some length. Oberlin faculty are very self-scrutinizing. Many of our procedures lead us to evaluate ourselves and each other often, providing opportunities for the right kinds of questions to be asked and the right kinds of professional accomplishments to be emphasized. This is how it works: An individual or a department begins the process by writing a self-evaluation. This provides an opportunity to describe and claim professional legitimacy for women's studies work, and sends a message to those who participate at later stages in the evaluation process--a message that women's studies is an important part of the normal workload for individuals or departments. Also, a department will probably praise the individual for the work that she or he has emphasized in the self-evaluation, when that department is in the position of advocate--on behalf of its members--to the personnel committee that takes action on salary

or promotion. Thus self-examination can be an educational, organizing, and legitimating experience for women's studies interests. In English, for example, where there are a number of feminists, they have been able to do a lot of exciting things: They have established new courses (Love and Marriage in Nineteenth Century Literature; Feminist Criticism) and developed cooperative Winter Term projects involving people from other literature departments; and two years in a row they have defined a sabbatical replacement position as a feminist literature position. They have also achieved a redirection of emphasis in some "traditional" courses (e.g., sections of Introduction to Narrative Fiction focus on images of women).

Our tolerance and decentralization also mean, as I mentioned before, that there is room to provide opportunities for some of the kinds of learning experiences that may be important for a women's studies class, but are not traditional at Oberlin: using journals and other means of incorporating personal experience into the course; emphasizing (in course objectives and evaluation) small-group work. It is certainly permitted to do such things, although they are done in a low-key way because Oberlin is strongly oriented toward the curriculum, not toward teaching per se, and not toward "faculty development." This means two things: When opportunities come along to do what we would call faculty development, there exists a vacuum, or at least it takes a while before most people want to take advantage of those opportunities. For example, during the first few years of internal grants for curriculum enrichment and teaching development, there was not much competition for those grants, especially in the teaching area; therefore women's studies people—and others interested in transforming the curriculum—who could organize and get their proposals together had a good chance of receiving the funding or released time. In fact, we did take advantage of those opportunities and resources in a way that people who support the traditional curriculum were not as prepared to do. This opportunity enabled us to get faculty released time for developing new curriculum and to bring Florence Howe for one semester during her GLCA visit. The approach at Oberlin is always through the curriculum.

Because we are very curricularly oriented, we can also ask some of the "innocent questions" that Elizabeth mentioned which lead to larger questions. These questions are a legitimate entry point: Where are the women in history? Where are the perspectives on women in philosophy? What starts out as a curricular question, which is therefore very acceptable to the faculty, almost inevitably leads into much larger questions about the roots of history, philosophy, sociology, and the ways they are done.

Oberlin's emphasis is on procedures, traditions, and mission of the college. All colleges have in their statements of traditions and mission things that can be put to use in transforming the curriculum, and I urge you to use these when you go home. No college is going to say that it values things remaining the same or believes in a static definition of intellectual inquiry. Look in your mission statements and catalogs, your archives, statements of purpose by Boards of Trustees, and find statements on which you can hang your objectives. At Oberlin we can call on our tradition of commitment to women's education—even though it is an unexamined commitment—as the justification for a number of things we want to do. Commitments that go down on paper at Oberlin—and this is probably true in most institutions—have a certain force and power to them. They don't change the world, but they can be used in changing the world.

Take what is published in the catalog and other university documents seriously and act on them, and they can be used to transform the academy. Let me give you an example: A couple of years ago the Women's Studies Committee at Oberlin decided that we ought to appear in the catalog. We do not have any faculty hired as women's studies faculty. We do not have any courses called Women's Studies, but we have claimed many courses and quite a few faculty; so we submitted catalog copy when the deadline came, and our words were printed in the catalog. There we are. We have a new kind of legitimacy. When we put out a catalog supplement listing the courses that are related to a feminist view of the academy, complete with expanded course descriptions provided by faculty in response to our questions about "how this course is a Women's Studies course," we established another toehold to help us on our way. Another example: An ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women was appointed in the early seventies and produced a report with twenty-two recommendations which were passed by the General Faculty; now anybody who wants to bring about something that can be tied to those recommendations can hark back to them and say, "As it said in Recommendation Two, etc., etc., etc...."

The importance of this sort of documentation at Oberlin ties in with our procedural orientation. Once we respond to the procedural requirements of the institution, our action gets built into the permanent structure. Here is an example: Last year, a long-range planning committee made up of two very important elected committees sent a questionnaire to every department, program, and curricular committee (curricular committees don't have faculty that belong to them, and Women's Studies is a curricular committee) asking all sorts of questions, normally asked for long-range planning, about the curriculum and staffing, department size, hopes and dreams, and the like. The Women's Studies Committee could have said, "This doesn't really apply to us. We cannot answer these questions. We don't have faculty. We don't have courses of our own. We can't predict the curriculum because we have no control over it." Instead we took this as a serious task and produced a twenty-five-page document that is now cited as exemplary because it was very serious and followed all the rules. We said, "This question doesn't really apply to us in the way that you have asked it, but let us tell you about what would happen if the History Department had (or didn't have) someone teaching women's history. Let us tell you what would result in that department, and let us tell you about a model for a more powerful curricular committee—with power to effect curriculum revision—that would let us get on with our work. And let us thank you for the opportunity to do this, because it was a very important thing for us to do." That document is important and is cited by people interested in other interdisciplinary programs as an example of what can be done to snatch victory from the jaws of "inapplicable" questions.

Let me describe another way to become institutionalized and to move into a status of normality. Our Educational Policies Committee does a review of departments routinely every few years. This year, for several reasons, one of the people on the subcommittee to review programs decided that, in its review of one particular department, it would be important for the committee to ask about the proportionate numbers of women and men majors. Other very procedurally-oriented and fair-minded people said, "If we ask this department, we really should ask everybody." The decision has not been made yet, but if that question is incorporated as a "normal" question for all departments, it will have ongoing effects that will multiply beyond the question itself. This is an example of how to pose a question that could very well become a formal part of the institution's operations.

I should say that some of these things that I'm citing as advantages also have negative consequences. Decentralization means that the Women's Studies Committee can negotiate with the Individual Majors Committee to set guidelines for an Individual Major in Women's Studies, and it never has to come up before the whole faculty to enter the catalog and to become institutionalized. But it also means that when a new interdisciplinary course for first-year students was developed as an "introduction to the liberal arts," that very important course was developed by two individuals from two departments, without broader consideration, without community knowledge, and without involvement of those most interested in a feminist transformation of the curriculum. The first week in September, when I realized that of the fourteen people lecturing in this course, not one was a woman—and that nothing was included in this course that spoke to the current critique of theory and method in these disciplines, I quickly sent around papers on this I had heard at the National Women's Studies Association conference—and people said, "Oh, yes, we really neglected this. We'll have to think about it next time." This did not and will not, however, come up in any central public place. In our decentralized system we have no routine way to make this a public issue, so we do not have the built-in opportunity to educate and to raise consciousness in public debate that a more "controlled" system might give us. So there are costs.

Another example leads me to the committee and the project I want especially to talk about. As I said, students can be heard if they are students who have legitimacy, either as majors in a department or as members of an organized student group. This means that the project which I am about to describe—and which I think has great potential—could be institutionalized largely because of the very important role that students played in the early stages of its development. Last spring, just before the Board of Trustees was to meet on campus, the members of the Board's Educational Policies Committee met with a student group called Mainstream, with which some of you are already familiar. Mainstream is a group of students interested in getting women's studies and feminist perspectives infused into the curriculum. They had an informal chat with members of the Educational Policies Committee, and as a result, the Committee recommended to the Board the following motion, which then passed:

Resolved, that the Board requests the administration to report to it not later than April 1980 its findings on the effectiveness of Oberlin College in meeting the educational goals of its women students including curriculum content, attitudes of faculty and administration toward furthering professional preparation and graduate opportunities, numbers and level of responsibility of women administrators and faculty members.

I do not fool myself into thinking that it was an item of very high priority for the Board. I don't think it was, but it was passed because our Board of Trustees also finds it difficult to turn down recommendations that call for "the good and the right." The Board asked the President to produce this report, and the President asked me to take charge of producing it. At that point, I made a decision that I want to tell you about because I think it was a strategic decision. I could have gone into my files and papers, interviewed some people, collected some data on students and majors, and reported to the Board; it would have been relatively easy work. Instead, I decided to ask the President to appoint a committee, which I would chair, to work on this; it

would be more complicated and involve more work for me but would accomplish a number of other things. Number one, of course, it would create visibility, making this an important issue on the campus, not just a minor item on the agenda. Number two, the committee would be constructed of people who would have credibility and visibility themselves and who would come from a variety of places on the campus and represent different constituencies.

Because Oberlin is so curriculum-oriented, so content-oriented, aspects of people's education that are not cognitive are not as highly valued. That means that most of the faculty—who are on the cognitive side—do not work closely with people such as those in student services who are on the experiential or affective learning side, and who contribute in very important ways to the education of students at Oberlin. I thought that if I could get the right constituencies on this committee, not only would the campus realize that the education of women at Oberlin is a broader issue than a cognitive one, but also that people who normally would not work together—and may not even have met each other—would work together. On a committee of seven people, I have managed to get representatives from the following constituencies: the Women's Studies Committee, the Committee on the Status of Women, black students and administrators, a senior male faculty member who is also on the most important elected faculty committee, the Student Affairs staff, the Conservatory as well as the College of Arts and Sciences, women's studies majors, a student who is seeking degrees in both the College and Conservatory, and representatives of several other important committees and constituencies. There we all are in one seven-person committee. The members of my committee are visible to many people.

Of course these committee people are very overburdened. We cannot by ourselves do the kind of thorough study that we would like to do, so we will be inviting, co-opting, and including others in our work. We are farming out the responsibility for finding answers to questions to other constituencies, committees, and individuals. These are questions about the curriculum, about faculty, about a student's chances of being able to take a course from a woman in her or his years at Oberlin, about the classroom, and about if and how support services are organized to meet the needs of women. We will be able to use evidence that is credible at Oberlin to answer some of our "innocent questions." Research is being done on what goes on in classrooms, on the composition of the classrooms, and on how the gender of teacher and students pertains to what goes on. We will start from questions that are acceptable and legitimate at Oberlin and will expand from there. I won't list all the questions for you. You can imagine some of them and you can imagine some of the kinds of data and information that we are going to use. I have high hopes for this committee and what its report may lead to.

In conclusion, I would like to say one other thing about this and about some lessons I am learning. One of the first things I've done to prepare for the work of this committee is to write to twelve colleges which are among those with which we like to compare ourselves, and ask whether they have any information that will shed light on this project. What, I have asked them, are the educational needs of women students? I haven't heard from very many of them yet but, interestingly, all but one were single-sex colleges that have gone coed. I would like to read you a brief letter that I got back from one of them. I suffer sometimes from a "grass-is-greener" syndrome and feel

periodically as if I should really be in a women's college where women's needs are taken seriously and met. Indeed there is evidence that many women's colleges are very seriously reexamining their mission and how successfully they do fulfill the needs of their women students. Just by coincidence, the first response I received was from a prestigious women's college which shall remain nameless. It shocked me because rather than saying, as some other colleges are doing, "We're addressing the questions of motivation, self-confidence, goals of women, what they need in the curriculum, more directly than we ever have in our history," this is what the vice president and dean said:

Dear Dean Goldsmid:

Thank you for your letter of October 22 inquiring about the status of women at _____. Since _____ is a college for women only, it would be difficult for us to have the kinds of problems with them that your inquiry suggests may be present at Oberlin. I do not believe we have the kind of studies you request.

Now, I may not have expressed myself clearly enough in the letter that I sent to the dean at that college, but his letter has been a curative dose for my grass-is-greener syndrome!

ALISON BERNSTEIN: I want to make my remarks very brief because we promised to have some give and take. I just want to make two quick observations about Paula's and Lou's remarks. As they were both talking, I was writing down my responses to their strategies and I passed a note to Elizabeth. When I heard Paula talk, I thought she was saying that there are positive uses of anarchy in the academy. That is, if you have an anarchic institution—which is the way I would describe the decentralization at Oberlin—there are some real advantages to that. And when I heard Lou talk, I thought this is an example of the uses of controlled consensus in the university. Both of those presentations are what I would call institutional presentations: They are concerned with how one works within an institution. Since I don't represent any of the GLCA colleges, but rather that amorphous outside world, I want to pitch my remarks quite briefly to transforming the academy by making use of the external forces which one can bring to bear on institutions—whether they are anarchic, or whether they are controlled consensus institutions, or something in the middle.

I want to give you an anecdote from my own research because I think it is appropriate. My field is American Indian history in the twentieth century, and it doesn't take much to understand that one can get very despairing about the history you are uncovering. Particularly despairing are the efforts to do something of a positive nature in terms of federal policy toward Indians. Well, interestingly enough, the strongest and most powerful times in terms of Indian reform in this country were the Depression and World War II. And the reason for that, those of you who have some sense of history will know, is that when a minority is that small and a minority is, in fact, is being ignored by the rest of the population, the fastest way to get it into the nation's consciousness is to have everyone else in a very sorry state. During the Depression, which for Indians was not a depression but more of the same, the rest of American society had to begin dealing with those problems that

were already pervasive in Indian communities all over the country. World War II also had a very important effect on Indian communities. The Civilian Conservation Corps, which was not designed for Indians, was used by Indians for all kinds of self-development, as was the GI Bill of Rights. Many Indians who served in the military during World War II later used GI benefits for their own purposes. It was the external forces that were brought to bear that sometimes made incredibly positive changes.

Using that analogy, I want to mention some of the conditions that I think apply now—conditions which represent not internal forces but external forces, and which, in a strange way, can be used for the purposes of transforming the academy. For example, it is no surprise to me that women and minorities have been talking about the curriculum since the 1960's, but that white males are particularly interested in that topic now. It has as much to do with the economics of higher education as it has to do with pedagogy and values and everything else. The concern about declining enrollments in traditional liberal arts disciplines is as much a reason, in my judgment, for this new concern for liberal education and liberal education reform as any of the more well-intentioned and internalized concerns over how we teach and what we teach.

The declining enrollment phenomenon is a very powerful phenomenon and can be used in a variety of ways. Let me give you some examples. The declining enrollment phenomenon has a tremendous impact on the employment of faculty members. Where once women were singled out as the journeying persons—the part-timers, the people who came in and left and did not have what is commonly known as a typical academic career—men are now facing the same kind of dilemmas. Women who want to transform the academy can use this issue of itinerate scholars for all kinds of different structural changes, in terms of the role and status of part-time faculty members and so forth. Especially important to me is the breaking down of that very unfortunate tracking of faculty into academic careers, and then keeping them there for thirty or forty years. There needs to be more movement back and forth between the academy and the outside world. The whole notion of an employment crisis for both women and men has very transformative possibilities for the academy that feminists ought to take advantage of.

Similarly, the whole question of declining enrollments gives students a leverage in the 1970's and 80's that students in the 60's, when I was going to school, did not have; and I think one cannot underestimate the power of student concern for and attention to what the curriculum is not providing. It may be true that for the GLCA colleges declining enrollments is not as profound a problem, but in some departments it might well be tremendously profound in terms of what is being offered and where FTE's are headed. We have a tendency when we are in an institution only to look upon how one works internally, but I think the enrollment picture is a picture that really ought to be looked at as an external condition that we can use.

Let me comment on another issue. I heard a lot today about feminist teaching styles, and I want to make a point about this because there is a danger in assuming—and I think Lou made the point as well—that feminist teaching styles shunt you off into some corner where you cannot communicate with those people who may not use the words "feminist teaching styles," but are as eager

to deal with certain implications of educational reform as feminists are. I'm not saying they are feminists. I'm just saying that if you broaden the discussion and talk about the integration of theory and practice, the use of classroom and non-classroom-based learning, you are advancing a feminist approach in a way that many other people can accept. I'm a great one for making two distinctions: one in terms of political coalitions, and the other concerning the integrity of ideological positions. It seems to me that people can make all kinds of political coalitions which advance certain of their objectives without feeling that they have been sullied by those coalitions. It depends very much on whether ideological perspective is intact. Those people in the reform of liberal education arena, mostly white males these days, are potential allies, and in fact need to be resensitized to those issues that feminist educators have been talking about for the last ten years. Liberal education reform is a women's issue, and many people in women's studies know that in their hearts. It is a hotly-debated issue, and feminist educators need to regain control of the discussion in a way that I think we lost, because we went off understandably into our own concern for what is feminist pedagogy and what are feminist styles of people. Some of that integration needs to be finally effected.

My last point concerns the small number of women faculty in GLCA colleges. The problem is fascinating to me because I'm struck everytime I come to a GLCA meeting with what I called yesterday the illusion of critical mass. It looks as if there are a lot of women in the GLCA colleges. But this is the representation of twelve institutions, and I think there ought to be creative ways to get more women faculty in these institutions. I understand that the GLCA has a grant for career development for faculty. How can you use this occasion for encouraging everybody to rethink academic careers in a way that can meet feminist objectives?

(At this point, Elizabeth Minnich invited the audience to join the discussion.)

ELIZABETH MINNICH: This discussion pulled together in many ways the kinds of things that I have heard going on throughout the conference. Now I would just like to remind you of what I said at the beginning of the conference—that it is very important that we see where we are, as well as what we have done, and that we know how far we have come, at the same time that we know realistically what our problems are.

I have heard in the space of this conference—and it does not by any means always happen—people talking about what they would like to see, what they care about, their visions. I have heard analysis of where we are accompanied by description which makes that analysis accessible to other people. I have heard exploration, open talking which at times has been highly personal, about things that matter a great deal to people, and at other times has been purely the result of interest, of looking at things not as someone involved. And those ways of thinking have worked together. There have been times when I felt as if people could have become very angry; there were times when people were open enough to say that something hurt them; and there were times when people said, "This is very exciting." There has been a movement from vision, to analysis and description, to highly personal thinking and feeling, and back to practical techniques for how you function. This is a kind of model for

feminist work when you are trying to do things without getting done in, and it also does something else that we talked about at the very beginning—it breaks down divisions. Sometimes in the course of a single statement by one person, discussion has moved from the personal, to the institutional, to the political. I mark those three phases because there is overlap, and there is also some difference in the focus. You have gone from the personal, to the institutional, to the political, back to the institutional, back to the personal, using those as ways of focusing comments, sometimes concentrating on one—knowing that they overlap, making real distinctions—and then moving on. That is a very strong thing not only to do, but to know that you have done—and when people tell you there is only the one phase that matters, or only the other, you know otherwise. You do otherwise.

During the time that I have been here, I have talked with a fair number of you individually, as well as in the meetings; and in the course of those conversations, I have realized something about what I said (in the keynote address) that I would like to make still more explicit. I talked about critical thinking and about friendship, and I talked about the tremendous drain that it is on people to live in a world in which false divisions are maintained. Oppression is draining on both the oppressor and the oppressed. To keep yourself closed, protective, defensive, angry, takes an incredible amount of energy. So also does being subject to other peoples' energy. And I said that the feminist academy was built on critique and friendship and therefore was going to let that energy loose. I didn't realize until I talked with some of you about friendship, and about critique, and about the cost of living in the world the way we have been living in it, how much energy really is a third aspect of feminism—critical thinking, friendship, and the release of good, strong energy. You have given proof that it has happened. You feel it. When somebody asks the right kind of question, there is a burst of energy released. There is a freedom in feminist work, and the excitement and energy that comes from being with friends. Such work moves back and forth across thought and feeling and action, and you find yourself more alive. It is the kind of feeling you get when you have had a problem, when something has been sitting in there and you couldn't quite figure it out, and then somebody says, why don't you do it this way, or think about it that way? I saw this happening to myself and others this past hour. There is a freshness in it.

At the end of a time together like this, people are always tired, but my very strong sense—certainly for myself, and I think I get it from others—is that it is a good tired. It is a clean tired. The wonderful thing about energy, like friendship, is that as you spend it, you get more of it. I thank you very much for giving me a chance to share in it. It really spreads and it is genuinely exciting.

One last thing: Another name for energy is "spirit." I spoke at the very beginning of my talk about watching out for the founding metaphors, the images behind what people are doing. Alison has an image, a metaphor, that we can choose for ourselves. And it is right to close with a vision from an old friend of yours.

ALISON BERNSTEIN: This is a metaphor that a woman told me about a week and half ago at a meeting, and I am very glad to share it with you. People were talking about planning a conference. In the midst of the discussion, one

woman told about the making of Persian rugs. When a Persian rug is finished, she said, there is a design, but it is never fully completed; and the term for the opening which is always left in that design is "spirit gate." It struck me that it might be worth sharing that as a metaphor to remind us that the energy has not ended, but there is always room for more—in terms of the spirits coming and going.

ELIZABETH MINNICH: Thank you all very much.

Fifth Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference

TOWARD A FEMINIST TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACADEMY

November 2-4, 1979

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2

1:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Caucuses—This time is to provide persons with specific interests and concerns to meet together with others similarly interested. At the community meeting on Saturday morning, caucus representatives may briefly bring their concerns and plans to the attention of the conference participants. In addition, the black and student caucuses may begin planning their own conference for later this year.

Film—"Gertrude Stein: When This You See, Remember Me"

Videotape—"Marianne and Moya"

4:00 p.m. Keynote Address—Elizabeth K. Minnich, Philosophy and Associate Dean of the Faculty, Barnard College, will present her vision of the transformed academy.

7:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Student Caucus

Disciplinary Sessions—An opportunity for participants to meet with others in their own discipline, to discuss problems and progress within their field.

Feminism and the Established Curriculum in English and American Literature—Nicholas Jones, Oberlin.

Modern Languages—Carolyn Durham, Wooster; Margaret Fete, Ohio Wesleyan; and Judy Vickers, Hope.

Philosophy—Joan Straumanis, Denison.

Psychology—Getting Tenure: Sex and the Evaluation Process (Round-table discussion)—Brenda Bankart, Wabash.

Sociology/Anthropology—How has feminism changed our teaching? We will share experiences about teaching

styles as well as curricular modifications and resources. What problems have we encountered with these new revisions or resources? What subjects or aspects of the classroom have been most difficult to change? Students are welcome to comment on their experiences in sociology or anthropology courses, both as to the effectiveness of women's studies courses in these disciplines as well as the extent to which women's issues are treated in other courses--Rita Kipp, Kenyon.

Meeting of Librarians--Patricia Renn-Scanlan, DePauw, Convener.

Meeting of Student Services Personnel--Carol Arner, DePauw, Convener.

9:00 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Caucuses (As arranged by interest groups)

Introduction to Women's Music--An analysis of women's music--what it is, who does it, how it is performed--will be followed by the sharing and learning of music. --Bonnie Woods, Columbus; Juliana Mulroy, Denison; and Heidi Boenke, Oberlin. Others will be invited to lead feminist songs.

Films--Films from the GLCA Women's Studies Program Collection will be available for viewing. This is an opportunity to review films for possible class use.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 3

- 7:30 a.m. Non-Competitive Games--Alternative exercise from a feminist perspective--Jami Peele, Kenyon; Juliana Mulroy, Denison.
- 9:00 a.m. Community Meeting--Caucus Reports, NWSA report, discussion of current status and plans of GLCA Women's Studies Program, other news of common interest.
- 10:30 a.m. "Van Wert College"--This hypothetical "typical liberal arts college in the Midwest" is beginning the process of revising its mission and--beyond the curriculum itself--administrative policies and practices as they affect all aspects of the educational experience. A presidential committee will look at current manifestations of racism, sexism, classism, and heterosexism in the institution, and recommend courses of action. Members of the committee are Peter Frederick (History, Wabash), Maria Lugones (Philosophy, Carleton), Barbara Smith (Women's Studies, University of Massachusetts-Boston), Rosanna Williams (Student, Antioch), and Chairperson Joan Straumanis (Philosophy, Denison).

1:30 p.m.

Concurrent Sessions:

Racism/Sexism in the Classroom--Because minority women in our predominantly white institutions have little opportunity to meet and establish their own networks--and because in "mixed" racism/sexism workshops minority women are too often expected to assume responsibility for telling white women and men how to cope with their racism--we have planned small group sessions for white participants. Facilitators for groups of faculty and administrators are Margaret Berrio, DePauw; Kaaren Courtney, Ohio Wesleyan; Diane Crothers, Vassar; Mary Margaret Fonow, Denison; and John Schilb, Denison. Facilitators for student groups are John Marshall, Denison; and Sarah McCrosky, Antioch.

Black Women's Meeting--A purpose of the meeting is to consider planning a Black Women's Conference. --Rosetta Moore, Associate Dean of Students and Director of Career Development and Counseling, Wooster, Convener.

- * Women's Sexuality (for women only)--A structured consciousness-raising experience redefining female anatomy: slides, music, poems, testimonials, and discussion. To facilitate open and frank discussion, this session is open to women only. --Ann Simon, Antioch; and Pat Jeanchild, Women's Sexuality Collective of Yellow Springs.

Sexual Harassment in the Academy--This session will address the issues involved in dealing with sexual harassment at the personal and institutional levels. As an example of institutional "coping," the history of the development of a grievance procedure at Denison will be discussed. --Nan Nowik, English and Women's Coordinator, Denison; Amy Rothenberg, Student, Antioch; and Deb Hilty, English and Secretary of the College, Wooster. Moderator: Syd Schnaars, Women's Resource Center Coordinator, Ohio Wesleyan.

"Marianne and Moya"--Video Filmmaker Liz Mersky sensitively chronicles the lives of two lesbian mothers, showing how each came to terms with her homosexuality and explaining the problems and joys of parenting in a lesbian household. Discussion will be led by Marianne (of the videotape) MacQueen, a carpenter by trade.

3:15 p.m.

Concurrent Sessions:

- * Where are Black Women in the Curriculum?--Black women are invisible in Women's Studies, Black Studies, and the curriculum as a whole. Black Women's Studies shows that not only are black women missing as content in disciplines, but this lack seriously distorts the conceptual framework within which we work. --Kaaren Courtney, Ohio Wesleyan; and Barbara Smith, University of Massachusetts-Boston.

Strategies for Faculty/Librarian Cooperation in Collection Development and Feminist Research Methodology--Who is responsible for ordering women's materials? Who controls funds? How are we to balance our collections? How does research methodology in women's studies differ from other research? How have library subject headings promulgated sexism/racism? -- Jami Peelle, Librarian, Kenyon; Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Librarian, DePauw.

- * Feminist Teaching Styles--A session on feminist teaching styles considering such questions as: What formats are most appropriate in the feminist classroom? What sort of writing assignments best suit our feminist needs? What do you do with the accumulating despair that certain texts may produce? Is there a conflict between the reward system (i.e., tenure, contract renewal, salary) and a feminist teaching style? What are the possibilities (and traps) of non-hierarchical teaching and learning? And the larger and more inclusive question: What effects does feminist thought have on teaching styles? --Nan Nowik, English and Women's Coordinator, Denison.

The Visual Arts--"Do Contemporary Films Significantly Critique Patriarchy?" --John Schilb, English, Denison; "How Are Feminists Transforming Art History?" --Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Art History, Wooster; "Historiogenic Art: Women and Futures" --Bonnie Woods, Artist, Columbus; and "Effects of Isolation on the Women Artist" --Joyce Parr, Artist and Teacher, Kenyon.

Feminist Advising and Counseling--Examination from a feminist perspective of decisions faced by college students making academic and life plans. Discussion of the role of faculty advisor in raising and responding to feminist issues with students. The session will include an experiential component. -- Ann Simon, Faculty member, Center for Cooperative Education, Antioch; and Sarah McCrosky, Student, Antioch.

Women and Health Care: The Modeling of an Interdisciplinary Women's Studies Course--This session will focus on the theme of women and health care as the most direct way of involving students in an interdisciplinary women's studies class. We will argue that this theme has the greatest potential for transforming individuals' consciousness and hence the academy. The session will begin with a description of the interdisciplinary course that has been taught at Denison for the last four years. Since this course regularly involves guest speakers who give presentations on specific aspects of health care, this session will include two such presentations concerning the history of women as objects in and practitioners of medical science. -- Ann Fitzgerald, Women's Studies, Denison; Joan Cadden, History, Kenyon; and M. J. Hempel, Student, Denison.

6:30 p.m.

Concurrent Sessions:

The Structure of Inequality: Perspectives from the Social Sciences--Rita Kipp, Anthropology, Kenyon; Len Berkey, Sociology, Albion; Paula Goldsmid, Sociology, Oberlin; Janet Hyde, Psychology, Denison.

The Feminist Challenge to College-Community Relations--Panelists will explore possible creative relationships between the college and the community based upon the feminist commitment to women both inside and outside the academy. They will also consider the risks to academic women in moving outside of academic patterns. --Harriet Turner, Romance Languages, Oberlin; Deb Hilty, English and Secretary of the College, Wooster; Susan Figge, German, Wooster; Beth Irwin Lewis, Historian, Wooster Community.

Student-Teacher Relationships and Roles--Perspectives from the Country Club, Ivory Tower, and Radical Fringe. In what ways does a feminist analysis relate to a transformation of self and of one's roles and interactions with others? How can we transform relationship among ourselves given the constraints and pressures of existing structures?--Ann Fitzgerald, Women's Studies Coordinator, and M. J. Hample, Student, Denison; Ann Simon, Center for Cooperative Education, and Stephanie Smith, Student, Antioch; and Sally Mazor, Student, and Nicholas Jones, English, Oberlin.

* Where are Black Women in the Curriculum?

Tomorrow's Women: A Hopeful Look at Student Services in the '80's--This session will involve a combination panel discussion/participant involvement format. The panel of student services professionals will discuss issues relating to the future of student services from a feminist perspective. Areas covered will include: 1) admissions data about new women students; 2) the importance of faculty/administration/student relationships, 3) counseling and programming goals to facilitate non-sexist student development and community involvement. --Carol Arner, Assistant Dean of New Students, DePauw; Tom Arner, Counselor, DePauw; and Lucky Robinson-Weening, Director of Admissions, Earlham.

Biases and Barriers: Two American Painters, Alice Neel and Lee Krasner--Can the academy counteract the critical biases that have excluded women artists from the canon? A slide lecture on two outstanding artists, one a figurative painter in her eighties, the other an abstract expressionist in her seventies, who have not, so far, been included in the history of American art. --Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Art History, Wooster.

Administrative Policy: Key to Change (for faculty, administrators)--Formal and informal administrative policies are the keys to change in the academy as it is presently structured. How can we change the system while working within it? Critical issues: The search for, screening, and selection of faculty; the definition of credentials in terms of competencies; the involvement of women in institutional governance; the status of part-time and shared positions; maternity and parental leaves; informal and formal ~~rules~~ policies of discrimination against and affirmation of minority and women faculty. —Lou Brakeman, Provost, Denison; Marilyn LaPlante, Associate Provost, Kalamazoo; Diane Crothers, Assistant Director of Women's Studies, Vassar. Moderator: Jon Fuller, GLCA President.

9:00 p.m. Concert! Therese Ebell, feminist singer, song-writer, comedienne, and half-owner of Sea Friends Records, feminist recording company, Cincinnati.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 4

9:00 a.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Integrating Material by and about Lesbians into the Curriculum--Some of the questions to be considered will be: Areas of the curriculum in which material could logically be included; does sexual preference affect the interpretation of the material? bibliographical resources; materials by and about black lesbians. —Barbara Smith, Combahee River Collective; Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Art History, Wooster.

Women and the Politics of Science--A historian of science, a philosopher of science, and a biologist examine ways in which science has been distorted by sexism and how the resulting bad science has been used to justify sexism. The historian will discuss "Women, Slaves, and Other Children: Two Historical Cases and a Moral for Science"; the philosopher will consider a contemporary issue, "Sociobiology: Blaming Our Genes for Our Politics"; and the biologist will conclude with "Where in GLCA Are the Women in Science? Why aren't there more, and why aren't they here?"--Joan Cadden, History, Kenyon; Joan Straumanis, Philosophy, Denison; and Juliana Mulroy, Biology, Denison.

* Women's Sexuality (For Women)

9:00 a.m. The Student Call for Change: Administrative Policies (for students)--What and how do we learn? (e.g., curriculum, women's studies, libraries, faculty and administration.) How do we live as we learn? (e.g., sexuality, residence

halls, health care, social organizations, student government, life-style, and career planning...) What policies and attitudes pose problems for living and call for changes? How can we create changes in policies, processes, and attitudes? —Allison Batchelor, Student, Ohio Wesleyan; John Marshall, Student, Denison.

* Feminist Teaching Styles

Feminist Education in the Third World--What impact is feminism having on higher education in the Third World Countries? Is there Women's Studies? Do women have equal access to education? Does feminist education have a place in education for development? Does feminism compete with or complement consciousness about class and neocolonialism? -- Rita Kipp, Anthropology, Kenyon; Mona Koh, Malaysian student, Kenyon; Renata Wulff, Botany, Universidad Central de Venezuela; Margaret Fete, Romance Languages, Ohio Wesleyan; and Nellice Woltemade, Sociologist, Delaware, Ohio.

11:00 a.m.

Curriculum Reform, or What do you mean, "Our college should have a feminist curriculum"?--Louis Brakeman, Provost, Denison; Paula Goldsmid, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Oberlin; Alison Bernstein, Program Officer, The Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Moderator: Elizabeth Minnich.

12:30 p.m.

Buffet Lunch - Conference ends

*Sessions offered more than once.